

Navy Personnel Research and Development Center

San Diego, CA 92152-6800 TR 88-4 November 1987



2

AD-A189 377

DTIC FILE COPY

Officer Fitness Report Evaluation Study

DTIC
ELECTE
DEC 08 1987
S D
AD

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

87 11

Officer Fitness Report Evaluation Study

David G. Bjerke
Jeanette N. Cleveland, Ph.D.
Robert F. Morrison, Ph.D.
William C. Wilson

Reviewed by
Bruce B. Herman
LCDR Kenneth D. Davis

Approved by
John J. Pass, Ph.D.
Director, Personnel Systems Department

Released by
B. E. Bacon
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer
and


J. S. McMichael, Ph.D.
Technical Director

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Accession For | |
| NTIS CRASI | <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> |
| DTIC TAB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Unannounced | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Justification | |
| By | |
| Distribution/ | |
| Availability Codes | |
| Dist | Avail and/or Special |
| A-1 | |

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED | | 1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS | |
| 2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY | | 3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited. | |
| 2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE | | 4. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) NPRDC TR 88-4 | |
| 6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Navy Personnel Research and Development Center | | 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable) Code 62 | |
| 7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION | | 7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) San Diego, CA 92152-6800 | |
| 8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Naval Military Personnel Command | | 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable) N-32 | |
| 9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER Washington, DC 20350 | | 10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS | |
| 8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Washington, DC 20370-5300 | | PROGRAM ELEMENT NO 99000N | TASK NO 0 |
| | | PROJECT NO OM,N | WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO PO-T5167 |
| 11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Officer Fitness Report Evaluation Study | | | |
| 12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Bjerke, D. G., Cleveland, J. N., Morrison, R. F., and Wilson, W. C. | | | |
| 13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final | 13b. TIME COVERED FROM May 85 TO Feb 86 | 14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1987 November | 15. PAGE COUNT 77 |
| 16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION | | | |
| 17. COSATI CODES | | 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) | |
| FIELD | GROUP | SUB-GROUP | |
| 05 | 09 | Performance Appraisal | |
| 19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) The purposes of this task were to evaluate the effectiveness of the current process used to appraise the performance of Navy officers and to recommend a method for providing data that would aid in assigning officers to non-operational billets. Interviews were conducted with commanding officers, members of statutory and nonstatutory selection boards, detailers, and others to determine how the performance data were developed and used as well as to identify problems. The other military services and industry also provided information on their procedures. The interviews clearly showed that the current Navy officer performance appraisal data are designed to indicate who should be promoted and selected for key billets such as commanding officer. However, the Navy uses the information in many inappropriate ways such as non-operational assignments and selection for educational programs. The other services provided additional techniques for | | | |
| 20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS | | 21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED | |
| 22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL R. F. Morrison | | 22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (619) 225-6911 | 22c. OFFICE SYMBOL Code 62 |

19. ABSTRACT (cont)

- establishing scores for promotability but none for making differential assignments. Recommendations included improving the instructions for describing jobs, completing the narrative, ranking lieutenants, establishing a procedure for controlling manipulation, developing methods for training commanding officers, counseling officers, and identifying unique abilities of officers.
- 

FOREWORD

Research at the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center aimed at improving the Navy's officer performance evaluation system was conducted under document number N6298085POT5167, titled "FY85 Fitness Report Evaluation Study."

This report describes an intensive series of interviews with Navy fleet- and shore-based commanding officers and executive officers; officers assigned to the Naval Military Personnel Command; selection board members; personnel appraisal system managers in industry; and evaluation system managers at headquarters of the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps. An extensive review of pertinent performance appraisal literature is also presented.

B. E. BACON
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

J. S. McMICHAEL, Ph.D.
Technical Director

SUMMARY

Problem

The report on the Fitness of Officers (FITREP) is the major document used for evaluating naval officers. The current FITREP system has been in use since January 1974.

The recurring problems of grade inflation, halo effect, and the tendency of reporting officers to write "glowing" narratives have led to questions of the FITREP's usefulness in selecting officers for promotion and assignment. In addition, the FITREP's ability to portray a candid display of an officer's strengths and weaknesses has been questioned.

Purpose

The purposes of this study were to (1) evaluate the effectiveness of the current FITREP in promotion and assignment decisions and (2) recommend methods to create a more candid display of an officer's qualities, job skills, performance, and potential.

Approach

The approach used was to (1) determine what reporting seniors in the Navy have in mind when completing an officer's FITREP; (2) determine FITREP users' perceptions of the usefulness of FITREP information for job assignment, promotion, officer feedback/counseling, etc.; and (3) collect information from published research and selected industry regarding the characteristics of effective personnel appraisal systems.

Data were obtained by (1) interviewing Navy fleet- and shore-based commanding officers (COs) and executive officers, officers assigned to the Naval Military Personnel Command, selection board members, personnel appraisal system managers in industry, and evaluation system managers at headquarters of the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps; and by (2) a review of pertinent performance appraisal literature.

Findings

Navy Interviews

Interviews with 82 naval officers representing the Unrestricted Line, Restricted Line, and Staff Corps communities revealed that

1. COs have a single purpose in completing FITREPs: to identify promotable officers and those who should be assigned to key billets that lead to promotion.
2. Selection board members believe that the FITREP is an adequate indicator of an officer's promotability and potential for command (in spite of grade inflation).
3. The ranking an officer receives (in block 66) is the primary discriminator used in the selection board and detailing process.
4. Informal processes, such as the submarine CO's supplementary letter to detailers, support and add discriminators to the evaluation system.
5. The narrative (block 88) is often poorly structured, poorly written, and often lacks concise or useful information.

6. The scope of an officer's job is not described adequately in the FITREP.

7. COs, particularly first tour COs, desire additional training on the effective preparation of FITREPs.

8. Selection board members and detailers feel that lieutenants recommended for early promotion in block 62 should be ranked in block 66.

9. Several methods to manipulate numbers in sections of the FITREP, such as the ranking selection (block 65 and 66), are known by most reporting seniors.

10. Most officers believe that the FITREP is an unacceptable officer counseling tool; it does not effectively communicate an officer's strengths and weaknesses.

11. There is no demand for a major change to the FITREP.

Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps Interviews

Each service believes that its current officer evaluation system is working very effectively. Common characteristics of other services' officer evaluation systems are as follows:

1. A detailed job scope description is available.

2. The rater is the ratee's immediate supervisor.

3. The immediate supervisor's evaluation of an officer is reviewed by one or two reviewing officers.

4. The evaluation is not signed by the ratee.

5. Counseling is a separate, independent process, distinct from the evaluation process.

6. Negative consequences occur for raters who inflate evaluations.

7. Extensive rater training is provided on the evaluation process.

8. Inflation is explicitly controlled.

9. No candid assessment of an officer's strengths and weaknesses is included in the evaluation. (This is a separate process.)

10. Accountability for evaluation policy, design, and use is clearly separated.

11. Evaluation systems are accepted by the officer corps.

Industry Interviews

Common characteristics of personnel appraisal systems in the nine corporations interviewed are as follows:

1. A complete job scope description is required (usually on the front of the evaluation form).

2. Ratings of performance are used, rather than ranking against peers.
3. There are multiple raters and reviewers, starting with the immediate supervisor.
4. There is extensive training of raters in the evaluation process.
5. The use of performance information is tied to personnel decisions or compatible decisions.
6. Companies utilize long-term career planning for high-potential personnel only.

Literature Review

A review of the performance appraisal literature identified five common characteristics that influence the effectiveness of the performance appraisal process:

1. Performance appraisal information should be gathered and used for a clearly defined purpose or compatible purposes.
2. An effective appraisal system must have the acceptance of the ratee, the rater, the organization, and society in general.
3. Rater training is particularly effective when training is extensive and allows for rater practice.
4. Constructive mutual feedback between supervisor and subordinate is an essential component of effective personnel appraisal systems.
5. A personnel appraisal system must be efficient to administer.

Recommendations

Based on results of the entire study the following recommendations are made:

1. Provide an outline in the worksheet instruction for the duties assigned section (block 28) that includes a detailed description of job scope.
2. Rank lieutenants who are recommended for early promotion.
3. Define a narrative format in the worksheet instruction, and train COs on effective completion of the narrative.
4. Establish procedures to eliminate manipulation.
5. Conduct research to design an effective counseling system.
6. Conduct research to design a FITREP training program for COs.
7. Conduct research on methods to aid in the process of making nonstatutory board decisions and job assignments outside an officer's specialty.

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Problem and Background | 1 |
| Purpose | 1 |
| APPROACH | 1 |
| Sample | 1 |
| Procedure | 2 |
| RESULTS | 4 |
| Interviews With Commanding Officers | 4 |
| Purpose | 4 |
| Decision Steps | 4 |
| Contextual Factors | 6 |
| Unique Factors In the Evaluation of General URL Officers | 10 |
| The General Unrestricted Line Officer: Noted Differences | 10 |
| Concerns Raised by COs | 11 |
| Summary | 12 |
| Interviews With Navy Detailers | 12 |
| Detailers' Use of the FITREP in the Assignment Process | 12 |
| Purpose | 12 |
| Concerns Raised by Detailers | 14 |
| Interviews With Navy Statutory Selection Board Members | 15 |
| Purpose | 15 |
| Mechanics of Selection Boards | 15 |
| Information Used in Navy Promotion Decisions | 16 |
| Concerns Raised by Board Members | 17 |
| Recommendations | 18 |
| Interviews With Administrative Board Members | 18 |
| Purpose | 18 |
| Subspecialty Board | 18 |
| Postgraduate School Screen | 19 |
| Restricted Line--Intelligence Officer Screen | 20 |
| Interviews With Other Military Services | 20 |
| Air Force Officer Evaluation System | 20 |
| Army Officer Evaluation System | 22 |
| Coast Guard Officer Evaluation System | 25 |
| Marine Corps Officer Evaluation System | 27 |
| Interviews with Industry | 28 |
| Common Features of Performance Evaluation in Selected Companies | 29 |
| The Navy Performance Appraisal Process Compared With Industrial Systems ... | 30 |
| Implications for the Navy | 34 |
| Literature Review: Criteria for Effective Performance Appraisal Systems | 36 |
| Clearly Defined and Compatible Purposes | 36 |
| Acceptance of the Performance Appraisal System | 37 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Rater Training | 38 |
| Effective Mutual Feedback | 38 |
| System Efficiency | 38 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 39 |
| Navy Interviews | 39 |
| FITREP Purpose | 39 |
| The FITREP's Role in Job Assignment | 40 |
| Ratings as Discriminators | 40 |
| Inflation | 40 |
| Candid Assessment--An Aid to the Job Assignment Process | 41 |
| Interviews With Other Military Services and Industry | 41 |
| Purpose of Performance Information | 41 |
| Explicit Documentation of Job Scope | 41 |
| Performance Appraisal Training | 42 |
| Summary | 42 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS | 42 |
| General Recommendations | 42 |
| Specific Recommendations | 43 |
| REFERENCES | 45 |
| APPENDIX A--NAVY OFFICER FITNESS REPORT | A-0 |
| APPENDIX B--AIR FORCE OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT FORM | B-0 |
| APPENDIX C--ARMY OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT | C-0 |
| APPENDIX D--COAST GUARD OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT | D-0 |
| APPENDIX E--MARINE CORPS PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM | E-0 |
| DISTRIBUTION LIST | |

INTRODUCTION

Problem and Background

The report on the Fitness of Officers (FITREP; Appendix A) is the major document used for evaluating naval officers. The current FITREP form has been in use without major modification since 1974. In the Navy's policy implementation instructions, the FITREP is described as "the primary tool used for comparing officers and arriving at career decisions with respect to relative merit for a. promotion, b. assignments, c. retention, d. selection for command, e. selection for sub-specialty, f. term of service, g. professional development training . . . , and h. other career actions as required" (Department of the Navy, 1981, p. 1). Elsewhere in the document, references are made to using it for providing junior officers with personal counseling (required) and for recording extremely extraordinary performance, such as misconduct.

Over the years, grade inflation has led to questions of the FITREP's usefulness in selecting officers for promotion and assignment. In particular, the FITREP's ability to accurately convey an officer's strengths and weaknesses to selection board members and detailers has been questioned. Furthermore, it is clear that the FITREP plays a critical role in the promotion of officers in the Navy. The commanding officer (CO) may place this purpose (promotion) over the others when completing the form.

A recent suggestion was to create a new fitness report--perhaps a form similar to the current worksheet, but without grades--to provide a detailed description of an officer's strengths and weaknesses. Other recent suggestions for changing the FITREP include (1) ranking lieutenants, (2) limiting the narrative to one page, (3) identifying tactical qualifications, (4) documenting counseling, and (5) canceling the requirement for reporting seniors to show the report to the rated officer.

The Navy Personnel Research and Development Center (NPRDC) has been involved with officer career issues continuously since 1978. NPRDC provided informal consultation on potential FITREP form revisions to the Naval Military Personnel Command (NMPC) in 1982. In 1983, NPRDC conducted a descriptive study of the Fitness Report form and it provided reports and recommendations to the Office of Naval Research in November 1984 (Larson & Rimland, 1984). In May 1985, NPRDC was tasked by NMPC to conduct a 10-month officer fitness report evaluation study to evaluate the Navy's current FITREP process.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to (1) evaluate the effectiveness of the current FITREP and recommend changes and (2) recommend methods to create a more candid display of an officer's qualifications, capabilities, performance, and potential.

APPROACH

Sample

COs and XO's. A total of 33 COs and 6 executive officers (XOs) in the Navy were interviewed for the officer fitness report study. The largest proportion of COs and XOs

interviewed represented the three Unrestricted Line (URL) communities (surface, aviation, submarine). Although the Restricted Line (RL) and Staff Corps (SC) communities were interviewed, the number of officers interviewed may not adequately represent the views or practices of the total community.

Junior Officer. Ten junior officers (JOs) stationed in the San Diego area were interviewed to provide some impression of their acceptance and understanding of the fitness report process. The number is too small to provide a useful representation of JOs perceptions.

NMPC Headquarters. Thirty-three officers stationed in Washington, D.C., were interviewed. These officers occupied key shore billets such as the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower, Personnel and Training) (OP-01) staff, Naval Military Personnel Command (NMPC) staff, detailers, Chiefs of the Nurse Corps and Medical Service Corps, Reserve Headquarters, and so on.

Statutory Boards. Thirteen statutory board members were interviewed. These officers served on promotion boards ranging from lieutenant commander to captain.

Nonstatutory Boards. Eight officers who had served on administrative boards were interviewed. The officers served on one of the following boards: postgraduate school (N = 2), intelligence community entrance (N = 1), surface XO (N = 1), subspecialty (N = 3), and aviation command screen (N = 1).

Other Military Services. Nine representatives from the Army (N = 2), Air Force (N = 4), Coast Guard (N = 2), and Marine Corps (N = 1) were interviewed. When possible, a headquarters policy representative, as well as an implementer, was interviewed. The rationale for this was that implementers provided a close view of the evaluation system, and the policymaker provided a description of the general promotion and assignment process of which the appraisal system was one component.

Industry. Individuals from nine organizations were interviewed. The organizations were selected using two criteria: (1) They had an appraisal system in place; and (2) for the most part, they had reasonably well-integrated promotion and job placement systems. These organizations may not be representative of the industry community. They were chosen because they either had a generally well-received system or had extensive experiences with less than satisfactory systems and thus could provide insight to the Navy. The individuals interviewed were all representatives of the personnel function in their organization.

Table 1 provides a breakdown of the interview sample. Another 5 to 10 organizations, contacted by telephone, provided information regarding their performance appraisal systems.

Procedure

Data were collected from Navy COs, representatives from the other military services, and organizations, using a semistructured interview format. Participants were asked to respond to a set of questions. The second portion of the interview was less structured in order to obtain information geared toward concerns of the CO or the unique aspects of a given organization.

Table 1
The Interview Sample

| Community | Designator | CO | XO | Nmpc | Junior Officers | Boards | TOTAL |
|--------------------------|------------|----|----|------|--------------------|--------|-------|
| <u>Unrestricted Line</u> | | | | | | | |
| General URL | 1100 | 1 | - | 5 | 3 | - | 9 |
| Surface | 1110 | 10 | - | 6 | - | - | 16 |
| Surface (reserve) | 1117 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| Subsurface | 1120 | 3 | - | 4 | - | - | 7 |
| Pilot/NFO | 1310/20 | 9 | 1 | 14 | 7 | - | 31 |
| <u>Restricted Line</u> | | | | | | | |
| Engineering | 1440 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Aeronautical engineer | 1510 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Aviation maintenance | 1520 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Cryptology | 1620 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Intelligence | 1630 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| <u>Staff Officers</u> | | | | | | | |
| Medical Service | 2300 | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | 3 |
| JAG | 2500 | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
| Nurse | 2900 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Supply | 3100 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| Civil engineer | 5100 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Subtotal | | 33 | 6 | 33 | 10 | 21 | 103 |
| <u>Other Services</u> | | | | | | | |
| Air Force | | | | | | | 4 |
| Army | | | | | | | 2 |
| Coast Guard | | | | | | | 2 |
| Marine Corps | | | | | | | 1 |
| <u>Industry</u> | | | | | | | 9 |
| Total | | | | | | | 121 |

Interviews With Navy COs. The intent of the CO interviews was to assess how the COs complete the FITREP. That is, what information do they want to convey about an officer and to whom (promotion boards, detailers, subspecialty boards, postgraduate school boards, etc.) Further, once this was determined, specific questions were raised on the use of grades (A, B, C, etc.), the narrative, rankings, and so on. A third set of questions asked COs to express their concerns about the use and usefulness of the FITREP form itself and the utilization of the information.

Interviews With Representatives From Other Services. Representatives of the other services responded to questions designed to obtain information on (1) the use of their performance appraisal information (for what decisions, primarily), (2) the specific features of their appraisal material (forms, who rates the officers, quality reviews, etc.), (3) the perceived effectiveness of their system, and (4) how personnel appraisal fits into the job assignment, subspecialty, and promotion processes.

Interviews With Industry. Although representatives from industry responded to a common set of questions, the questions were more open-ended than those generally asked of Navy COs or the other services.

Literature Review. Current literature in the area of performance evaluation and personnel decision making was reviewed. The purpose of the review was to tap an alternative source of information that assessed the most current practices in evaluation and to determine the primary characteristics of effective appraisal systems.

RESULTS

Interviews With Commanding Officers

Navy COs play a key role in determining the success of the fitness report evaluation process. COs complete the FITREP and provide the essential information that the Navy uses for such decisions as promotion, assignment, retention, selection for command, selection for subspecialty, term of service, professional development training, and other career actions as required. COs also use it for reporting incidents of extremely extraordinary behavior, such as misconduct, and for personal counseling (Department of the Navy, 1981). However, the multiple intended uses of the FITREP information may not be uppermost in the CO's mind when completing the form. In fact, a CO may complete the FITREP with a single purpose or goal in mind. Therefore, in order to assess the usefulness of FITREP information for such secondary users as promotion boards and command selection boards, it was necessary to interview COs to identify what they consider the key purpose of the FITREP and how they go about conveying this information.

Purpose

The purpose of the CO interviews was to determine (1) how fitness reports are written; (2) what factors influence the evaluation process; and (3) what COs do, do not do, will not do, or would prefer to do via the FITREP in the URL, RL, and SC.

Decision Steps

From the information provided by the CO interviews, two categories of variables were identified that affect the FITREP process decision steps and contextual factors. Decision steps are factors that COs consciously consider when they prepare a FITREP. The decision steps, or guidelines, have a direct impact on the final narrative, grades, and ranking on the FITREP. COs mentioned seven decision steps:

1. The officer's potential to assume greater responsibility.
2. The nature of the officer's billet.

3. The officer's performance in a billet.
4. The officer's seniority (i.e., proximity to review for promotion).
5. The informal relationship between the officer and the CO.
6. The use of "B" grades (or lower) and the narrative in the FITREP.
7. The officer's reputation within the community (primarily in the RL and SC communities).

Decision Step 1: Officer's Potential. The CO's primary consideration in the FITREP process is whether the officer should be (1) promoted to the next rank and (2) eventually selected for command within the officer's specialty. COs determine their officer ranking primarily on these two factors. COs feel that it is their duty to get their officers promoted and to recommend the future COs of the Navy. In the RL and SC, where there are fewer command billets than in the URL, COs tend to stress promotion potential. In these relatively small communities, community reputation appears to play a significant role in the command selection process.

To reiterate, uppermost in the CO's mind is the goal of promoting outstanding officers and eventually (particularly in the URL) placing them in a command billet within their specialty. Decision Steps 2 through 5 are used to determine whether an officer has the potential to take on greater responsibility.

Decision Steps 2 to 5: Billet and Performance. In the URL, RL, and SC, COs use these decision steps to fine tune the actual ranking of the officers in terms of promotion and command within their specialty. Specifically, all other factors held constant, a CO would rank highly officers who were (1) in a specific position viewed as a key, or career-enhancing, billet (e.g., in aviation, the squadron operations department head would be ranked higher than the administration department head even though the two officers' performance in their billets was similar); (2) top performers in their current assignment; and (3) more senior within their rank (especially if the officer is approaching command screen). Finally, the informal relationship between the officer and CO may be a factor. Since these factors are considered simultaneously by the CO, different outcomes can result.

Decision Step 6: Grades and the Narrative. Another decision step involves the use of "B" grades and the use of the narrative to supplement the rankings. That is, assigned grades reflect the outcomes desired by the CO. If the CO wants the officer promoted, few, if any, B grades are given to the officer. However, in the lower ranks (ensign and lieutenant junior grade), Bs may be given to an officer. This is not viewed by COs as a negative report. On the other hand, COs are aware that Bs given to higher ranking officers indicate a negative report. Further, Bs in particular traits or blocks of the FITREP indicate a poor evaluation. For example, a B in Desirability for Command (block 57) is a clear signal from the CO that a more senior officer (i.e., O - 4 and above) is well below average. Note that frequently the worksheet (Appendix A) is not used at all.

The narrative is written to be consistent with the CO's ranking of the officer. Although positive in tone, a narrative can identify a poor performer by what is left unsaid. On the other hand, for outstanding officers, most COs write a pointed and hard-hitting narrative with specific recommendations for assignment into key billets. However, there is great variation among COs in the quality and content of the written narratives. For

example, in the Nurse Corps, the narrative is structured to include specific, uniform information for all officers; while in other communities, the structure of the narrative is much less uniform.

Decision Step 7: Officer's Reputation. Officers' reputations in a community, particularly in the RL and SC communities (and possibly submariners), may precede them when they change billets. Therefore, COs may have a general perception about officers prior to actually observing them.

Contextual Factors

The contextual factors are characteristics of the evaluation process that indirectly affect the FITREP narrative, grades, and ranking via the decision rules. COs may not be aware that these factors influence evaluation. Eight contextual factors were identified as affecting the CO/FITREP process:

1. Navy Value System. This contextual factor refers to the relative importance that the CO places upon the officer's specialty, leadership, and management skills. This is a critical contextual factor in the FITREP process. COs in the warfare specialty communities focus on the development of warfare specialty skills in the Navy. CO comments include "The Navy drives ships and subs and flies airplanes." This comment reflects the strong, consistent (yet narrow) focus of operational COs when evaluating their officers.

This same value system, emphasizing the importance of operational (sea duty) experience, is represented in the RL and SC communities. Even though specific, technical education is usually a requirement, the source of officers for a number of RL communities is the URL communities; and these officers bring the URL value system with them. For example, the primary source (80% to 90%) of intelligence and engineering duty officers is the URL. Frequently, these officers have technical bachelor's and master's degrees as well.

Jobs or activities that combine both combat or Fleet experience and staff skills are more valued than activities that involve exclusively technical or staff functions. Officers who have a balance between operational tours and staff or technical tours are more highly regarded than officers with primarily staff or technical tours and few operational tours.

2. Competition Within and Across the Navy Communities. This factor involves the CO's perception that other COs may be more lenient (rate higher on the FITREP) in rating their own officers. Therefore, if COs do not give high grades, they believe they are hurting their officers' opportunities for promotion or command. There is a general recognition among most COs that they should grade highly or they may inadvertently end an officer's career. Grades of B or lower are the exception, not the rule, for outstanding officers at any rank and normally are assigned by COs only to indicate a below-average performer. For example, in the aviation community, COs will tend to give high grades to aviators if they believe that COs of other squadrons are doing so. Because the standards for rating officers are perceived as varying across commands within a community, board members state that they tend to put little emphasis on concurrent FITREPs and primarily refer to the one prepared by the immediate superior in command (ISIC). For example, the FITREP that the carrier air wing commander prepares for an operational squadron CO will carry more weight than the one prepared by the functional wing commander.

This belief that other COs are giving high grades exists across URL communities as well. Among the COs interviewed, there is a general consensus that the aviation and submarine COs grade highest, while surface COs grade slightly lower. Because of the variation in standards across URL communities, the FITREPs prepared by a CO from one community on a subordinate officer from another community do not receive as much consideration by boards as FITREPs prepared by an ISIC from the officer's own community. Such experiences commonly take place in shore activities.

COs in the RL and SC are aware that the FITREP ratings in the URL are inflated. However, since there is no direct competition between the RL, SC, and URL, this factor is not a major concern. There is some concern about inflation within the RL and SC communities, especially since there are a large number of "1 of 1" FITREPs (i.e., where there is only one officer of that grade within the command). On the other hand, RL and SC COs believe inflation causes fewer problems in their designators, because the size of the communities are so small, and they know their officers.

The medical community, of all communities interviewed, has the lowest incidence of inflated FITREPs. There appears to be an unwritten norm that FITREPs will not be inflated. Other factors could be the physical separation of the reporting seniors from the COs and strict external standards that define levels of performance very precisely.

3. Nature of the Interaction Between COs and Officers. Another factor that may contribute to grade inflation involves the nature of the interaction between the CO and the officers. Specifically, COs differ slightly in the degree and the manner in which they interact with their officers. COs in the surface community, for example, frequently do not share a common level of technical competence with their officers. On the other hand, COs in the submarine and aviation communities share more common technical areas with their officers and therefore interact more with them on an informal basis (socially as well as professionally).

Further, in all of the RL and SC designators interviewed, the officers have a shared technical expertise. For the most part, they are professionals as well as naval officers. The officers interact as professionals in order to share their technical knowledge. Therefore, the distinction between levels in rank may be less clear in the RL and SC communities than in some URL communities. COs who have a close, informal relationship with their officers may inflate FITREP ratings in order to maintain that unity.

However, the close professional interaction is not evident in all communities. For example, in the Civil Engineer Corps, the proximity of the officer to the CO varies tremendously. Some officers will not be observed directly by their CO because the officer's assignment is off site; while other officers may be "closer to the flagpole." When an officer is off site and not directly observed (only observed on site visits or inspections), the CO must rely on indirect information (billet hierarchy, immediate supervisory input) on which to base the FITREP ratings and ranking. Therefore, the off-site officer may receive a less favorable ranking and ratings than an officer whose behavior is directly observed by the CO.

For most surface COs and officers, this is not so. In surface communities, COs rely more on formal interactions to accomplish activities. More grade inflation is likely to occur in communities (submarine and aviation) with more informal interactions between COs and officers than in surface communities, where there are fewer shared technical areas.

Therefore, the separation between levels in rank is less clear in some communities than in others. Those COs who have a close relationship with their officers inflate ratings on the FITREP in order to maintain that unity. COs who operate through more formal interactions with their officers are less hesitant to give B grades on the FITREP. This may be a partial explanation for the low incidence of grade inflation in the medical community.

4. Perceived Purpose of the FITREP. In NAVMILPERSCOMINST 1611.1 (Department of the Navy, 1981), the stated purposes of the FITREP include promotion, assignment, and retention. The interviews were designed to determine what purposes the COs perceive to be most important when they complete the FITREP. The perceived purpose of the FITREP tends to direct the CO toward specific sets of officer behaviors and away from other behaviors. For example, in all communities, the COs stated that the FITREP is completed to get their people promoted and, where relevant, into command positions within their specialty. Therefore, COs in these communities focus more upon the officer's operational performance than upon the use of a subspecialty. Thus, the FITREP data are most appropriate for promotion and command-related decisions within specialty and are less appropriate for academic assignments, performance and career counseling, or nonoperational job assignment decisions.

5. Feedback to the Average or Poor Performing Officer. Most COs provide a form of performance feedback to their officers via the FITREP. This presents few concerns when COs provide feedback to top performing officers. However, confronting the less than outstanding or below average officer is more difficult. The interviews indicated that some COs assume that reactions to negative FITREPs would include a decrease in morale or even officer alienation that could lead to poorer performance or withdrawal from the Navy altogether. This would be detrimental to the unit's ability to complete its mission. Therefore, the COs, especially in the warfare community, tend to inflate the ratings of less than excellent or average officers and provide lenient performance feedback.

6. CO Background Experience. Another contextual factor that has an indirect impact on CO ratings is the COs' (1) experience in writing FITREPs, (2) experience in their own specialties, (3) knowledge of the selection board process, and (4) degree of contact with detailers. For example, first-tour COs have less experience in writing FITREPs and may give more Bs to their officers than a more senior CO because they are not aware of the importance selection boards and detailers place on a grade of B.

COs indicated that having served on a board greatly improved their FITREP writing. They said that COs should be required to have board experience before they are allowed to complete FITREPs. Board experience helped these COs write more direct, meaningful narratives and understand what information the promotion boards need and look for in order to make decisions.

In addition, the experience of the CO influences the structure and quality of the narrative. More experienced COs write brief, precise, hard-hitting narratives that include unique phrases (identifying outstanding officers), bullet format, underlining key phrases, and so forth.

Similar to Fleet and shore COs, there is considerable variation in the type and amount of training that RL and SC COs have had in FITREP writing. All COs emphasized the importance of, and expressed a need for, training.

COs' prior experience outside their specialties (for example Washington duty) influences specific billet recommendations in the narrative. COs with such prior experience are more knowledgeable of what those billets entail and can recommend specific assignments in the FITREP narrative for their officers.

In the Fleet interviews, there was a great variation in CO experience in each of these areas. Although in shore commands the COs varied only somewhat in experience, it was clear that in general, shore COs have more experience in the FITREP process than most Fleet COs. The main reason for this is that the shore COs interviewed had a Fleet command prior to their shore command. Therefore, the most junior shore CO had some previous experience in writing officer fitness reports. In addition, since many of the shore COs are more senior, they are more likely to have served on a selection board. For both Fleet and shore COs, board membership is a key training experience as well as a determinant of the degree of quality of FITREP narratives.

7. Community Entrance Standards. The length of entrance programs differs among the various communities. This usually has an effect on the maturity and seniority of new officers when they leave particular entrance programs. The length and rigor of entrance programs and entrance requirements affect the COs perception of the quality level and quality composition of the community's pool of officers.

Unlike the URL, the RL and SC officers must have satisfied certain educational requirements and standards before they enter a specific community. Many of the RL officers are former URL officers and hold advanced degrees, have obtained credentials from postgraduate school, and have various proven subspecialties.

In addition, the length of the entrance program for the communities varies. The aviation community has the longest entrance program. Therefore, when officers leave that program, they are more senior than those officers leaving surface entrance programs. Subsurface has the second longest and most demanding entrance program. Therefore, by the time officers begin duties in the submarine community, for example, they will have passed a lengthy entrance program, including testing hurdles and certification requirements within their specialty. One implication of the different entrance programs is that there are more hurdles to pass in the longer programs. Therefore, it is assumed that below average or poor performers will be screened out. Thus those officers who remain will be of higher quality. For example, in the subsurface community, COs generally believe that they have the "cream" of the Navy. This perception may translate to more inflated grading on the FITREP than, for example, in the surface community. However, the variation in the responses among the communities did not appear to be any greater than the variation in responses from within a particular community.

8. Size of Community. Repeatedly, COs in the small, homogenous submarine, RL, and SC communities stated that they knew their officers, especially the "front runners." This "community reputation" plays a larger role in decisions (FITREP evaluations, primary assignment) in these communities than in the larger aviation and surface communities or more heterogenous General URL community. In addition, COs from the former communities who had promotion board experience stated that board members knew the rating style of most COs, since the community was relatively small. Therefore, a lieutenant commander's FITREP, for example, with two Bs from a harsh rater may reflect a stronger promotion recommendation than an all-A FITREP from an easy rater.

Unique Factors In the Evaluation of General URL Officers

Although some Fleet COs evaluate General URL (GenURL) officers, shore COs tend to have greater proportions of GenURLs within their commands. When a shore CO writes a FITREP on a GenURL, the intended purpose is once again to convey to boards who should (or should not) be promoted. However, for warfare URL officers this promotability evaluation is primarily based upon the officer's warfare specialty skills. The COs interviewed stated that they must go through a slightly different process for the GenURL. This process is not as well defined for the GenURL as it is for other URL officers. In fact, all shore COs interviewed recognized that GenURLs must meet different requirements in order to be promoted. However, there was less agreement on what these requirements are and wide variation in CO experience as to the "best" career paths for the GenURL. Some COs emphasize activities that are most closely aligned with Fleet operations for those GenURL officers that they want to promote. In addition, some COs take time to find out what the GenURL officers are doing and clearly document the responsibilities (number of people supervised, budget size, Fleet interactions, etc.) that they have had. A number of COs believe that in order to be promoted, the GenURL officer must have demonstrated a balance of both leadership skills and technical skills; other COs do not. Therefore, COs try to highlight these skills for those GenURL officers that they want to promote.

During the shore interviews, it was not uncommon to hear that a specific billet or billets are dead-end positions for warfare designator officers, especially lieutenant commanders and above. Comments reflecting this included "He will retire from this billet," or "No one is promoted out of this position." However, COs pointed out that such jobs are not considered dead-end positions for GenURL officers. Positions that are considered dead-end billets for URL officers may be considered "front-runner" positions for the GenURLs. This fact lends itself to confusion at FITREP time, especially when URL and GenURL officers, within the same rank and having similar jobs, are compared (ranked) against one another.

From the interviews, two common themes emerged regarding shore COs' perceptions of the GenURL. First, in general, shore COs stated that they believe their GenURL officers (predominantly females) are topnotch "front-runner" performers in the specific billets they occupy. Most, although not all, COs indicated that the GenURL officers frequently perform better than their URL counterparts in the current billet.

However, the second common finding among shore COs reflects the ambiguity of the role of the GenURL in the Navy. Although COs believe that GenURLs perform well in current billets, they had greater difficulty estimating and then evaluating the female officers' potential for greater responsibility. Underlying this difficulty is the CO's confusion regarding the potential for increased responsibilities of GenURLs. In other warfare communities, the evaluation of potential for promotion and command is based upon the COs view of the officer's warfare and specialty skills. However, the same promotion-estimates paradigm can not, or is not, being applied to the GenURL officer. In fact, there is no uniform approach to completing the FITREP on GenURL officers.

The General Unrestricted Line Officer: Noted Differences

One major difference between the URL warfare communities and the GenURL is that COs do not know the GenURL jobs as well as they know warfare jobs. There is a need to have a well-defined job scope statement on the FITREP for GenURLs. In addition, the career hierarchy for GenURL officers is much less well defined. Therefore, unlike the

URL, once a strong officer is identified, it is difficult to know which officer billets are career enhancing and which are not. In addition, since hierarchy is less clear and since in the URL the nature of the billets held is one input into what ranking the officer will receive, COs tend not to know how to rate or rank GenURL officers. Currently, COs feel that they can rate these officers lower and the officers will still be promoted. Fortunately, the precept to the selection boards is that boards should promote a similar percentage of GenURL officers as they promote warfare specialty URL officers.

Concerns Raised by COs

During the interviews, COs across the three communities (URL, RL, and SC) raised a number of common concerns regarding the FITREP process. Five issues emerged from the interviews:

1. General Purpose of the FITREP. COs complete the FITREP with promotion and command-related selection decisions in mind. However, they believe the Navy may want the FITREP "to do too many things." This bothers COs, who would like to see a consistent (and preferably united) approach concerning the purpose of the FITREP.

2. CO Conflict in Completing the FITREP. COs feel that they know what information the boards and detailers need in order to make decisions. And they feel they know their officer's strengths and weaknesses. However, COs express conflict between their obligation to identify average (or less than average) performers and their obligation to write a FITREP that will not kill their officers' chances for promotion. In this regard, COs feel "hypocritical" rating most officers as the top 1 percent, when most officers obviously are not.

3. Impact of Possible FITREP Modification. A major concern of COs is the impact of possible FITREP changes on the outcome of promotion and command selection decisions. They are concerned that major changes (such as those occurring in the early 1970s) will disrupt a system that COs feel is working now.

4. Issues Concerning the Narrative. COs want to know more specifically how to outline and what information to include in the narrative. They recommend training on the use of key phrases or words in the narrative in order to indicate different levels of officer performance. They believe that the consistent use of key words and phrases by COs would be helpful to boards and detailers. In addition, COs recognize that the writing skills of COs can influence the quality of an officer's FITREP. At this time we do not know if problems concerning the narrative reflect the level of CO writing skills or a lack of consistency in what information is included.

Even though COs are expected to recommend in the narrative specific future assignments for their officers, they have difficulty in recommending specific assignments outside their specialty. In addition, unless COs are familiar with specific Washington billets within their specialty, they do not make such recommendations.

5. Manipulation of Ranking. COs recognize that manipulation occurs but do not know how widespread it is. They said that manipulation occurs in the following ways:

- a. Rank all officers #1 and mail FITREPs in separately;
- b. Rank 2 or 3 officers #1, rank 2 or 3 officers #2, and mail FITREPs in separately; or

c. Inflate the number of officers in a given rank, so an actual "3 of 3" ranking becomes, for example, "3 of 6."

Summary

In summary, the CO completes a FITREP with only two questions in mind: (1) Should the officer be promoted? and (2) Should the officer be selected for a command billet within the warfare or designator specialty? Traditionally, performance appraisal information is used by the rater for several purposes: performance review; feedback; improvement and career counseling (for the ratee); recommending pay increases; recommending promotion, demotion, firing, or transfer; and recommending other development activity. COs do not use it for all of these purposes, but they use it primarily for promotion and operational command-related assignment recommendations.

Interviews With Navy Detailers

Detailer's Use of the FITREP in the Assignment Process

COs in the Navy are the initiators of the information conveyed by the FITREP. The purposes for which they complete the FITREP are central to understanding the basis for other decisions. As users, COs complete the FITREP to convey to promotion boards an officer's potential to take on greater responsibility within a specialty.

The next section covers the interviews with Navy detailers, a key group of central decision makers who have access to FITREP information and who use it for a variety of purposes (such as job assignment, career planning, etc.).

Purpose

The purpose of the detailer interviews was to obtain information on (1) the detailer's use of FITREP information, (2) the information they use when making assignment decisions, and (3) the problems they encounter concerning the FITREP.

Information Used as a Basis for Assignment Decisions. Detailers said that their role in the Navy is to assign an officer to positions that are the best fit for the officer and the Navy. The needs or requirements of the Navy play the major role in this process; and within these constraints, detailers try to incorporate the officer's career needs and preferences into the assignment.

The information that detailers use to make billet assignment or placement decisions is of two general types: (1) billet information (billet hierarchy) and (2) officer information (largely from the FITREP).

Job Information and Billet Hierarchy. Although not formally stated, there is a hierarchy of career-enhancing billets in the Navy. Each community has a hierarchy of good (and not so good) billets. Within each community, the billets vary by (1) the officer's rank and (2) whether it is a shore- or sea-duty billet. For example, the billet hierarchy (in descending order) for lieutenant, tactical air aviators may be as follows:

Shore Duty

1. Admiral's Aide
2. Detailer
3. Chief of Naval Operations Staff (OPNAV)
4. Fleet Replacement Squadron (RAG) Instructor
5. VX Squadron
6. Training Command
7. Support Command

Sea Duty

1. Assistant Navigator
2. Flag Lieutenant, Carrier Battle Group Staff (CARGRU)
3. Squadron
4. Other Ship's Company (carrier)

Also, within each type of duty there is a hierarchy of billets. For example, within OPNAV and ship's company (carrier) billets, the hierarchy for lieutenant, tactical air aviators may be as follows:

OPNAV

1. OP-O6 (Plans, Policy, and Operations)
2. OP-O5 (Air Warfare)
3. OP-O9 (Program Planning)

Ship's Company (carrier)

1. Assistant Navigator
2. Assistant Strike Operations
3. Catapults
4. Combat Information Center (CIC)
5. Carrier Air Traffic Control Center (CATCC)
6. Flight Deck
7. Hangar Deck
8. Fuels

What does this hierarchy mean for the officer? If in a good billet and performing well, an officer is more likely to receive a higher ranking on the FITREP than an officer who performs well in a billet that is lower in the hierarchy. The higher (more favorable) ranking, coupled with the type of billet the officer has held, is a large determinant of the types of billets in which the detailer will consider placing the officer.

Career-enhancing billets also lead to a greater likelihood of promotion. That is, board members give greater weight to a "1 of 6" ranking for an instructor at the Navy Fighter Weapons School than a "1 of 6" ranking for an instructor in the Advanced Training Command. Detailers place officers in "good" billets when they believe the officer is a front runner (is highly promotable). The detailer bases this judgment of promotability, in part, upon the past billets held by the officer. In addition, the detailer uses the information regarding the officer's performance in those billets, which is conveyed largely by the FITREP.

Officer-Related Information. One judgment that detailers need to make prior to placing an officer in a specific billet is to determine the officer's promotability. To do so, the detailer relies upon the information provided by COs in the FITREP. Detailers said that they focus upon three areas of the FITREP. First, they review the ranking (in block 66) in relation to peers (lieutenant commanders through captains who are recommended for early promotion are ranked) to determine the officer's overall performance and promotability. Next, they review the narrative, especially if the officer receives a "1 of 1" ranking in block 66 or if the officer is a lieutenant or below and is not ranked in block 66. Third, the detailers attempt to determine what the officer can do by looking at

previous assignments, responsibilities, and accomplishments. This information may be obtained from the FITREP summary (Officer Summary Record) or (in greater detail) in either the narrative or the brief job description section (block 28) on the FITREP.

Coupled with the type of billets held by the officer, the FITREP ranking is a key determinant in the detailer's assessment of the officer's promotability. Highly promotable officers are then placed into billets high in the career-enhancing hierarchy. After the estimation of the officer's promotability is made and the set of billets appropriate for the officer is determined, such information as officer preferences is used to place the officer into a specific assignment.

Concerns Raised by Detailers

Lack of Realistic Feedback to Officers. A major complaint from detailers is that COs do not tell the average or below average officers that they did not, in fact, receive a strong FITREP. Detailers stated that they (detailers) frequently are the ones who are the first to inform an officer of a weak FITREP. This event usually occurs as the officer is about to be assigned to a nondesired billet or to a billet that is not believed to be career enhancing.

Some COs, particularly in the submarine community, supplement FITREP information with a letter to the placement officer or the detailer. More frank, straightforward information regarding the officer is transmitted in these letters. The detailers that were interviewed believe that it would be beneficial for the Navy to formalize this source of information. On the other hand, detailers pointed out that the supplemental letters are consistent with their complaints that COs do not use the FITREP to inform the officer of poor performance.

Identifying Officer Strengths and Weaknesses. For the majority of billet assignments, detailers stated that they do not need information regarding the specific strengths and weaknesses of officers. They believe that a good officer can do any job in the Navy well, and the FITREP ranking is sufficient (for the most part) to assess the officer. This is a belief espoused throughout the Navy that there is no real need to match an individual's skills with the requirements of a billet. However, detailers insisted that they must know at least where officers stand in the top third, middle third, and bottom third in order to assign them appropriately to billets. Sometimes detailers find it difficult to do this for lieutenants and below, who are not ranked. In particular, the middle third, or "pack," is often difficult to determine.

On the other hand, there are some billets, high-visibility jobs, for example, that present a different set of problems for the detailers. These billets are especially prevalent in shore assignments. Here, detailers stated that knowing the relative strengths and weaknesses of an officer would be extremely helpful. The FITREP does not help them determine such strengths and weaknesses. Related to this, high-visibility billets or billets that require special technical skills are often not clearly placed in the hierarchy of career-enhancing billets. That is, once a detailer assigns an officer to such a billet, the officer may complain because it is unclear whether the position is a front-runner position or whether it is low in the hierarchy. Since these jobs may be less clearly placed in the job hierarchy, detailers tend to place their topnotch officers in such billets.

Perceptions of Detailers. Detailers are concerned about the short-term placement of officers into billets that best meet the needs of the Navy. Detailers appeared to have two issues in mind when they place an officer in a specific billet: (1) the promotability of the

officer and (2) meeting the immediate needs of the Navy (by placing the most qualified officer into the more demanding position). Detailers are not managing the long-term career sequencing of jobs for officers. They do not consider the manpower requirements of the Navy for 5 to 10 years in the future. Rather, they look at the current skills of their officers and then decide to place them in billets that meet the Navy's immediate needs and that also get the officer promoted into the next rank. Detailers do not place officers into billets thinking that the job will develop specific skills that the officer might use for a key billet in 10 to 15 years. For example, detailers working with lieutenants and lieutenant commanders are not thinking about developing the relative strengths and weaknesses of an officer for a specific Washington billet (at the captain level or for a future Materiel Professional billet), but rather think primarily about requirements for lieutenant and lieutenant commander billets. The detailer is managing and trying to maximize the efficiency and fit between the officer and the Navy in short-term billet assignments. Thus, the detailer's requirement for additional information (other than the FITREP and billet hierarchy) appears to be limited.

Interviews With Navy Statutory Selection Board Members

A second group of FITREP information users in the Navy are members of the statutory selection boards. The selection of officers for promotion into the next rank is a key centralized decision making process in the Navy. Therefore, it was essential to ask board members to assess the role that the FITREP serves in making selection board decisions.

Purpose

The interviews were designed to (1) obtain a description of the mechanics of the board process, (2) determine what information the board members review and use to make decisions, and (3) obtain the board members' views on the type of information they would like to have in order to make decisions and their views on the selection process in general.

Mechanics of Selection Boards

The interviewed officers were currently serving or had served on boards that involved promotion. Although the process of selection is similar across promotion boards, the specific number of officers considered and the actual percentage promoted may vary from one board to another, from one promotion rank to another. A general description of the process follows.

The board receives a precept of the overall quota of officers to be promoted. This quota is based upon a specific percentage, such as 85 percent of the lieutenants that are within zone for possible promotion to lieutenant commander. Then the board decides informally, not via a precept, to allocate the overall quota proportionally within each community. For example, members of the lieutenant commander promotion board may consider 1,200 officers within zone. Here, board members would also review 1,000 officers below zone (approximately two year-groups below) and 200 officers who had been passed over once. For every officer above or below zone selected, one less may be promoted from within zone.

The boards may consist of 9 to 13 members, including a president, depending upon the type of promotion. The members meet in a board room, where each officer reviews the records of the individual eligible officers on a microfiche viewer. They also assemble in a screening room, or "tank," that has five projection screens in front. The left screen

displays background data similar to the data on the Officer Data Card (ODC). The other screens display all of the officer's FITREP information in summary form.

In the lieutenant commander board example, each board member acts as the initial, or primary, reviewer/briefer for approximately 200 officer files. The briefer reviews the record in conjunction with the Officer Summary Record (OSR), or brief sheet, which is projected in the tank. Folders (microfiche record and OSR) are distributed to members randomly. After each member has reviewed a series of records (for example, five each), the board assembles in the tank. The briefer has a few minutes (2 to 5) to discuss what is noteworthy about the particular record reviewed. Generally the board has agreed to certain elements that should be noted or highlighted in the discussion as well as how they will convey their recommendation to the board members. For example, they may use letter grades, and the briefer may recommend A through F. They may even use pluses and minuses. Grades would then equate to the level of confidence the board members can assign to the eligible officer when casting a vote (e.g., A is 100%, B is 75%, C is 50%, D is 25%, and an F is zero). A through D represent "yes" votes, but reflect the board members' confidence in how the officer would be able to perform at the next higher rank. The F, of course, is a vote of no confidence. A light signifies when a board member has voted, although the other members do not know what grade a board member gives an officer. However, members do know who is slow or quick to vote. A computer displays the average confidence level for the officer. The grades are displayed on a histogram from which the board can determine an initial distribution.

The board members generally review the entire list of candidates and choose the top officers (e.g., 20%) for promotion. A portion may also be designated as too low, and those officers would be non-selects. After the first review, each member receives a new set of records to brief. At this point, the recommendation process and voting is repeated. While the average grade that is acceptable for promotion may not change with each successive review, the re-vote standards may become lower. The boards go through a narrowing process, where the obvious top and bottom officers fall out. Those in between are re-voted, until the entire selection opportunity is filled.

Information Used in Navy Promotion Decisions

From the interviews with promotion board members, it was determined that they use a number of sources of information were identified. The two primary categories are officer information and job billet information from the FITREP. They look at the officer's jobs and how well the jobs were done.

Officer Fitness Report. Board members rely heavily on the information provided by a series of FITREPs to make promotion decisions. All of the officer's FITREPs are displayed on a screen to the board members in the form of the OSR (similar to what detailers have). This summary indicates the specific FITREP ratings and rankings received for each billet.

Job or Billet-Related Information. Each community representative informs the other board members of the community billets that are career enhancing and those that are not. This information is discussed so that all members realize that a ranking of, for example, "3 of 20" in a training command billet is in fact weaker than a "4 of 8" in a "Top Gun" billet for a fighter (VF) community officer. Each FITREP summary indicates the specific jobs that an officer has held and their significance. Therefore, it is reasonably clear what career-enhancing billets the officer has occupied. On the other hand, the officer summary does not indicate the level of responsibility that the officer demonstrated in

that billet. In order to assess both duties and responsibilities, board members review the FITREP narrative (block 88). The duties box on the FITREP identifies the billet but usually does not contain sufficient job scope information. However, those interviewed said that it is difficult to assess either the scope of the billet duties or the level of responsibilities required from the narrative. Further, the individuals interviewed said that only about 30 percent of the narratives are well written. A larger proportion of the narratives do not convey useful information regarding the quality of an officer or the scope of his job.

Concerns Raised by Board Members

In general, the board members who were interviewed believe that the FITREP provides adequate information for making promotion decisions. Although the members recognize that the FITREP is subject to some problems, they do not believe that major changes in the system are warranted at this time. However, when asked what information they would like to have but do not, one type of information was repeatedly mentioned. Members said that in the "crunch" (after the top promotion candidates are identified), it would be helpful to know the specific duties and responsibilities of the officers in the similarly titled billets. That is, beyond identifying those billets that are career enhancing and those that are not, it is difficult (even for officers from that community) to discern the actual level of responsibility and duties required in a given billet, especially shore billets. A few COs currently specify the scope of a billet in the narrative (block 88), although this practice is not widespread or systematic. Some board members stated that in the crunch it is helpful to know, for example, how well the officer could drive a ship or fly an airplane. Others stated that the narrative should be structured (not free form) to indicate, for example, the type of ship the officer served on, what the ship did, the size of the officer's budget, the retention rate of the unit, advancement rate, leadership behaviors, management skills, and the challenging tasks assigned and results obtained. Therefore, when members find it necessary to compare officers in the same type of billet code with the same FITREP grades, rating summary, or ranking, they believe that knowing more about the officer's specific responsibilities and accomplishments in the billet would be a key source of information in making a promotion recommendation. They would like to have this information documented more thoroughly.

To reiterate, after the briefings from each community representative, board members are aware of the billets within each community that are and are not career enhancing. For promotion candidates who are clearly front runners or who are clearly not promotable, this is sufficient information upon which to make a recommendation. However, in the larger gray area of candidates (the crunch), members express the need for more explicit, specific job scope and job accomplishment documentation.

The officers recognize that the FITREP has some limitations but, in general, they do not want major changes. When urged to discuss these limitations, they identified the following: (1) It is easy to identify the top and bottom promotion candidates but difficult to distinguish among the middle crunch (this could be as many as 60% to 70% of the candidates); (2) "1 of 1" FITREPs present an evaluation and promotion problem; (3) COs can cheat by ranking more than one officer "1" or "2"; (4) COs may allude to a problem in block 88 but "leave the board guessing"; (5) approximately 30 percent of the FITREP narratives are well written, 30 percent are poorly written, and 40 percent are adequate; and (6) some "grade creep," or inflation, is present.

Although all of these concerns are important, the first two appear to be the most frequently voiced concerns of the board members. The two concerns could be addressed if

members had access to the types of job information that they identified. Some of the other concerns could be addressed by targeted CO training. In fact, a key recommendation by board members was that COs receive FITREP writing training.

Recommendations

Board members stated that a poor FITREP writer becomes known in the tank very quickly. On the other hand, when the FITREP narrative (block 88) is well written, it has the following characteristics: It is one page long, key words are underlined, lieutenants are broken out (ranked), specific accomplishments are cited, potential is indicated, and more detailed documentation of the activities and accomplishments in a given billet are included. The words in the narrative are either in bullet format or if in narrative style, careful underlining highlights key phrases or words to the board members. The board members stated that COs should be trained prior to their first command to write FITREPs accurately. This training may include a description of the format and the information that should be included in the narrative. In addition, training on a practice, or mock, board was recommended.

Two other recommendations were raised. First, members believe that the necessity of the Joint/Office of the Secretary of the Defense block (block 60) on the FITREP should be reassessed. Few members know precisely what it is meant to convey. They would rather have more meaningful blocks on the FITREP (more tactical and operational information). A second recommendation suggests that the Navy look more carefully at the promotion process in terms of meeting the Navy's needs. From the interviews, it is clear that board members promote the best warfare officers (the best operational records). They are not, on the other hand, considering the billets that the Navy needs to fill and then selecting officers who would best fill them. That is, regardless of an officer's technical or subspecialty skills, the officer is promoted based on performance in the warfare specialty.

Interviews With Administrative Board Members

A third group of users who rely on FITREP information in making decisions is the nonstatutory selection and screening boards. There are approximately 76 administrative boards in the Navy. Interviews were conducted with current or former members of three administrative boards: (1) subspecialty board, (2) postgraduate school screen, and (3) in the RL, the intelligence officer screen.

Purpose

The purpose of interviewing administrative board members was to (1) identify what information the nonstatutory boards use to make decisions, (2) determine the degree to which FITREP information is useful in making such decisions, and (3) solicit recommendations for improvements from those interviewed.

Subspecialty Board

The three officers who had served on subspecialty boards said that the subspecialty board conducted a similar record review process as that in the promotion boards. Specifically, they selected lieutenant commanders and above for proved subspecialty status. An officer could obtain a subspecialty in one of the following ways: (1) Meet the specific education requirements for the subspecialty plus one complete tour using this knowledge (experience), or (2) complete two tours that designate these skills (experience)

without meeting specific educational requirements. Unlike the statutory boards, the subspecialty boards are not constrained to a specific number of requirements (how many officers should receive subspecialties, how many in a specific area, etc.).

One officer stated that a number of subspecialty board members were inclined to give a "P" (proved subspecialty) to front-runner operational officers even when these officers did not meet the minimum educational or experience requirements. Furthermore, officers who performed well in a subspecialty billet and met requirements might not receive the P because the officer was not rated high on warfare (operational) skills. Clearly, the Navy value system, which places great emphasis on warfare specialty performance, is influencing decisions regarding the designation of a technical, nonoperational subspecialty. The subspecialty boards are one arena where one might think the impact of the Navy value system would be minimal. However, the suggestion that a strong operational officer may be more likely to be selected as a proven subspecialist than a strong technical (yet weaker operationally) officer demonstrates the pervasiveness and perceived importance of the operational officer in the Navy.

Some of the officers interviewed indicated that the informal Navy billet structure (career-enhancing vs. dead-end billets) may contribute to the problem. Officers who have developed a critical subspecialty may be one step behind other officers operationally. That is, the officers with subspecialty status may not have "punched" the key billets that are needed to secure a promotion (and therefore allow officers to remain in the Navy). Those interviewed said that the Navy's view of education (postgraduate school) is that it is a necessary "ticket punch." If possible, the officer should avoid being placed in a billet that utilizes the subspecialty, as these billets are not usually career enhancing. The Fleet billets are generally more career enhancing and "fast track" (for promotion), and therefore, front-runner officers prefer them. However, the emphasis placed on the Fleet (or sea vs. shore billets) culminates in a manpower problem at the captain level. At this point, about 13 percent of the available billets are sea billets; while at the ensign grade, only 13 percent of available billets are shore billets. Therefore, at the captain level, the Navy may not have qualified officers for predominantly shore billets.

Usefulness of Fitness Report Information. To the extent that subspecialty boards use the "promotability" of an officer as one criterion in recommending a "proven" subspecialty code for an officer, the FITREP is useful. Although the officers interviewed were not explicit, it appears that the FITREP does an adequate job of identifying the promotability of an officer.

Recommendations. Few recommendations were obtained from the subspecialty board officers who were interviewed. However, one suggestion was to distinguish between promotion opportunities and operational command opportunities. Since command and promotion are currently considered jointly (and since there are fewer command opportunities than promotion opportunities), only those who are excellent operationally are promoted. If the command potential and promotion potential were considered separately, the officers with the proven subspecialty and excellent technical skills could be promoted (and remain in the Navy), even though they may not be topnotch operationally. This distinction could open promotion opportunities for subspecialty officers and for nontraditional career paths.

Postgraduate School Screen

Two COs who were interviewed regarding the FITREP were also former members on the postgraduate (PG) school selection board. These officers were interviewed primarily

to obtain their views as COs and not as board members. Therefore, little information was obtained on the usefulness of the FITREP as part of the process in selecting officers for PG school. However the interviews did yield useful information in two general areas: (1) what type of FITREP information is used for PG school decisions and (2) some recommendations on the type of additional information that would be useful.

FITREP Information. The officers interviewed stated that members use the FITREP ratings, rankings, and evaluation summary as well as the narrative in making PG school recommendations. However, they stated that it is difficult to ascertain the relative strengths and weaknesses within an officer from the FITREP.

Recommendations. The officers said that it would be useful to more fully document the officer's preferences, special talents, and proven subspecialties. In addition, in the narrative, they need to know the officer's technical knowledge, managerial skills, ability to make decisions, and potential for increased responsibility in the subspecialty areas. One of the interviewee's recommended that the Navy develop two distinct forms. One form, the FITREP, would be used primarily for promotion decisions and selection boards. The second form would be used to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the officer and lead to training designed to develop relevant skills.

Restricted Line--Intelligence Officer Screen

One officer was interviewed who had been a member of the intelligence officer screening board. He said that the intelligence community selects 96 percent of its officers from the warfare designators (URL). Entrance standards are very high, and there is great competition to get into the intelligence community. Only 15 to 20 officers are selected into the community each year. The officers selected must not only meet various educational and subspecialty standards, but they must have top FITREPs, and in order to be promoted within the intelligence community, officers must continue to receive near-perfect FITREPs.

Interviews With Other Military Services

In order to determine how performance information is used in other organizations for such decisions as promotion, assignment, and officer counseling, interviews were conducted with representatives from the other military branches and with select industry. The rationale for such interviews was that by understanding how performance appraisals are used in other organizations, the Navy might find practices or strategies that can be incorporated into its own fitness report evaluation system.

During July and August 1985, interviews were conducted with military personnel appraisal system managers, policy makers, and information users at Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps headquarters. In particular, the interviews were structured to obtain information about (1) the purposes of appraisal information, (2) the distinguishing features of the evaluation system, and (3) the major documents used in the process. The officers were also asked to discuss the rationale for their performance appraisal systems and to comment on the career development and job assignment processes.

Air Force Officer Evaluation System

Purpose. The purpose of the officer evaluation system is to provide the Air Force with information on the performance and potential of officers for use in making personnel

management decisions, such as promotions, assignments, augmentations, school selections, and separations. It is also intended to provide officers with information on their performance and potential as viewed by their evaluators.

Background. Air Force officer evaluation policy is established by Headquarters Air Force Manpower and Personnel Center, Randolph Air Force Base, and administered by the Personnel Measurement Division, also at Randolph. The Personnel Measurement Division is staffed by one lieutenant colonel (O-5) and three captains (O-3). The division has three objectives: (1) to monitor Air Force compliance with officer evaluation policy, (2) to continually improve the effectiveness of the Air Force officer evaluation system, and (3) to tabulate rating data that the Air Force Chief of Staff uses to review officer evaluation trends with each of the 13 Air Force major commands. By serving as an administrative center and corporate memory, the Personnel Measurement Division provides the foundation for continual review and update of the Air Force officer evaluation process.

In October 1978, the Air Force revised the officer evaluation process after the controlled rating format was abandoned. The controlled rating format, which restricted the percentage of officers who could receive top ratings, caused widespread dissension in the officer corps and proved to be unacceptable.

Distinguishing Features. The primary features that distinguish the Air Force performance evaluation system from the Navy system are the (1) indorsement chain, (2) counseling policy, and (3) the policy of not disclosing a colonel's promotion report to the colonel who is being evaluated.

One of the most distinguishing features of the Air Force officer evaluation process is the voluntary forwarding of reports in the indorsement chain. For example, a report is sent to a wing commander for indorsement. The wing commander may indorse the report; have the vice commander indorse the report; send the report back without action, allowing the previous evaluator to be the final indorser; or send the report to a higher level for indorsement. The higher the final indorser's rank, the more favorable the report. Although a large percentage of officers receive top Officer Evaluation Report (OER) ratings, few officers receive the highest (4-star general) indorsement. Indorsement level serves as the primary discriminator to identify officers with the best (and worst) potential for promotion.

The report is reviewed at several levels. The rater is the person designated by the Air Force to prepare an officer evaluation report. Usually, the rater is the officer's immediate supervisor. The additional rater is the rater's rater. The additional rater reviews the ratings and comments of the rater for completeness and impartiality and indicates agreement or disagreement. The indorser can be either the additional rater's rater or anyone higher in the rating chain (this is the voluntary forwarding up the chain provision). The indorser reviews the ratings and comments for completeness and impartiality and indicates agreement or disagreement with the report. Even though an indorser may not have personal knowledge of the ratee, the Air Force is confident that an effective review of the report can be accomplished. This review serves both the purpose of quality control over individual reports and the control over rater tendencies to overrate.

Another distinguishing feature is the Air Force officer counseling policy. The OER is not used as a counseling device. Counseling is considered a day-to-day process that should not be delayed until a periodic counseling session is scheduled or until an evaluation report is due. In fact, raters in the rating chain do not show the OER to the ratee, and the ratee

does not sign the OER. Officers may receive a copy of their OER upon request, only after it has been entered in their official record.

A third distinguishing feature is the "closed" performance evaluation of colonels. The Colonel Promotion Recommendation Report is never disclosed to the colonel being evaluated, either before or after it is filed in the official record. The report is designed for use only by general officer promotion boards. It is not used in any other personnel action. (Colonels receive an annual OER just like other Air Force officers, however.)

Major Evaluation Forms. Four forms are used in the evaluation process: (1) Officer Evaluation Report (OER) Form, (2) Education/Training Report, (3) Colonel Promotion Recommendation Report, and (4) Supplemental Evaluation Sheet. The first form is presented and described in Appendix B.

The purpose of the OER form is to document officer performance and potential for increased responsibility. In addition, the form provides evaluation space for use by successive members of the rating chain.

The purpose of the Education/Training Report is to document an officer's performance during periods of formal training. This one-page form consists of a detailed description of an officer's success (or failure) in academic training. It includes the name of the school, course title, hours completed, hours failed, degree awarded, thesis title, special achievements related to curriculum and research, and a description of the student's academic skills and abilities, as well as comments on the student's general attitude, appearance, military bearing, performance of additional duties, and whether the student received recognition for above average achievement.

The purpose of the Colonel Promotion Recommendation Report is to provide boards with the most complete, reliable, and objective information on the performance and promotion potential of colonels being considered for advancement to brigadier general. The one-page form provides space for a handwritten justification for promotion and recommendation for assignment. The contents of the form are not revealed to the ratee under any circumstances.

The Supplemental Evaluation Sheet is a one-page, multipurpose evaluation form used (1) to cover periods of performance too short for an OER (less than 120 days); (2) as a continuation sheet for referral reports; (3) to document missing reports, voided reports, and unrated periods; and (4) to record comments made by Air Force advisors.

Army Officer Evaluation System

Purpose. The Army's Officer Evaluation Report (OER) is designed to assess an officer's performance and to estimate potential for future service based on the manner of that performance. The primary focus of the evaluation is on (1) a comparison between the officer's performance and the duty position requirements and (2) the potential evaluation, which is a projection of the performance accomplished during the rating period into future circumstances that encompass greater responsibilities. The primary focus of the potential assessment is the capability of the officer to meet increasing responsibility in relation to peers.

Background. The OER information provides the basis for officer personnel actions such as promotion, selection for command, school selection, assignment, specialty designation, project manager designation, retention in grade, retention on active duty, and elimination. The current OER has been in use since 1979.

The Army's current Officer Personnel Management System (OPMS) was implemented in 1975. OPMS is implemented by the Officer Personnel Management Directorate of the Army Military Personnel Center, Alexandria, Virginia.

As part of OPMS, the Officer Evaluation Reporting System includes the methods and procedures for organizational evaluation and assessment of an officer's performance and an estimation of potential for future service based on that performance. The official documentation of these assessments is the OER.

Distinguishing Features. The primary features of the Army performance evaluation system are (1) the rated officer/immediate supervisor communication process, (2) the Senior Rater Profile Report, and (3) the rating chain.

The Army's OER procedures, which include immediate supervisors rating their subordinates, are designed to stimulate a continual two-way communication so that rated officers are aware of the specific nature of their duties and are provided an opportunity to participate in the specifications of billets and duties. The immediate supervisor/subordinate communication process also facilitates the dissemination of career development information, advice, and guidance to rated officers. This kind of structured (and required) communication between supervisors and subordinates also encourages the perpetuation of discipline and desired behavior.

The purpose of the Senior Rater Profile Report is to track the rating history of each senior rater. The report establishes all senior raters' credibility by recording how well they spread out their ratings of subordinate officer potential. This information is made available to both the senior rater and Army headquarters. Placement of the form in the senior rater's official record for review by selection boards emphasizes the importance of the senior rater's responsibilities to provide credible rating information. The Army is the only service that formally analyzes the rating style of its senior raters.

The Army's rating chain involves the rated officer, immediate supervisor, and a senior rating official in the performance evaluation system. The rated officer is the subject of the annual evaluation and has considerable responsibility in the evaluation process. In addition to performing to the best of their abilities, the rated officers must seek counseling when needed, discuss their duty description and performance objectives with their immediate supervisors, assess their objectives and update them as required, and describe their accomplishments at the end of the rating period.

The rater is the immediate supervisor. The rater is most familiar with the day-to-day performance of the rated officer and directly guides the rated officer's participation in the organization's mission.

The senior rater is the senior rating official in the rating chain. The senior rater evaluates the rated officer from a broad organizational perspective (the minimum grade for a senior rater is major). The senior rater's evaluation is the link between the day-to-day observation of the rated officer's performance by the rater and the longer-term evaluation of the rated officer's potential for advancement by Army selection boards. If there happens to be an intermediate level supervisor between the rater and the senior rater, the rating chain will include an intermediate rater.

Promotion Process in the Army. The Army has institutionalized a dual-specialty system that recognizes the increasingly limited opportunity for officers to be promoted into primarily operational positions. Since it plays a role in selection and promotion board decisions in the Army, the mechanics of the dual-specialty system warrant discussion.

The method used by the Army for officer professional development and utilization is the concept of dual-specialty development. Under dual-specialty development, the objective is for the majority of officers to gain and maintain proficiency in an "initial specialty" and later on to develop a second specialty that may be related to the initial one but is less operational in nature (this training usually begins by the eighth year of service). For example, an officer with an initial specialty in aviation might choose aviation logistics as an additional area of specialization. Further, a signal corps specialist might choose communications-electronics for a second specialty. All officers above the rank of captain are expected to simultaneously develop two specialty skills. The Army selection boards are provided with an officer quota for each specialty area in order to ensure that (1) the Army's skill and grade mix is in balance with its needs, and (2) officers who are fully qualified are selected to fill initial specialty and additional specialty needs.

For example, the Army may need to promote 200 officers to major. If the board is reviewing 400 officer candidates for major, it decides (1) how many of the 400 officers are promotable based on their initial specialty skills. That is, the board may determine that 350 officers are promotable within that group. Next, (2) the board looks within this acceptable group and attempts to fill quotas for each additional specialty area. It will not promote an officer who does not meet the 350 cutoff (based on "operational" performance)--even if the officer is a superior performer in the second specialty. However, an officer who is promotable but who is rated lower than another in his initial specialty (which is similar to the Navy designator) might be promoted over the other. These situations may occur when the officer has a second specialty in a skill that has not met its quota while the initial specialty has. Selection opportunity may vary among specialties, based upon projected requirements in the higher grade. Each board receives a letter of instruction from the Secretary of the Army providing guidance for the selection process. That portion pertaining to specialization indicates that the specialist has a role and responsibility that is equal to the role of the generalist.

Major Evaluation Forms. Two forms are used in the evaluation process: (1) the OER Form and (2) the OER Support Form. Appendix C presents and describes these forms.

The OER Form provides the Army with current performance and potential assessments of each rated officer.

Within the first 30 days of the evaluation period, the rater and rated officer must have a face-to-face discussion to develop a working copy of the rated officer's OER Support Form. The discussion covers the rated officer's duties, responsibilities, objectives, and contributions. The rated officer and rater initial and date the working copy, indicating discussion as well as agreement on the duty description and performance objectives. The rated officer updates the working copy to reflect the changes in duties and objectives as they occur. At the end of the evaluation period, the rated officer prepares a final Support Form, which the rating officials use in making their evaluations.

There are two advantages provided by the support form and the face-to-face communication process between the rater and rated officer. First the rated officer is informed of the specific nature and requirements of the job and may at an early stage provide input on what should or could be accomplished. Second, the meeting provides an opportunity for the immediate supervisor (rater) to (1) direct subordinates, (2) plan for attaining the mission, (3) gain information from ratees about their perception of the organization, and (4) find better ways to accomplish the mission.

In 1983, a survey was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the OER Support Form. Results indicated distinct differences between the perceptions of rated officers on one hand and senior raters on the other:

1. The Support Form was considered valuable by 62 percent of the rated officers, 77 percent of the raters, and 81 percent of the senior raters.
2. A majority (89%) of the raters felt they had coached or counseled their subordinates adequately; however, only 20 percent of the officers were satisfied that they had been coached or counseled adequately.
3. A majority (80%) of the raters believed they had complied with the regulatory requirement to discuss objectives with the rated officer within the first 30 days of the rating period, but only 31 percent of the rated officers acknowledged an adequate discussion. Moreover, 90 percent of the rated officers preferred to have this discussion.

The Army's OER System has been in operation since 1979. It is reportedly working without serious inflation by senior raters and with strong selection board endorsement. Board members have indicated that interpretation of the senior rater's evaluation of part 7 of the OER Form is dependent upon joint consideration of all three of its components--the box check, the profile, and the narrative--and all three aspects contain the senior rater's message to the board. Most senior raters are spreading their box checks across the top four (of nine) boxes. Some spread effective officers through the fifth and sixth boxes. The strongest selection board feedback is that those senior officers who focus primarily on the top box are "losing their vote" and "hurting their subordinates' chances " for selection and promotion.

Coast Guard Officer Evaluation System

Purpose. The purpose of the Coast Guard's Officer Evaluation Report (OER) System is to supply information to the Commandant for personnel management decisions such as promotion, assignment, and career development. In addition, the Coast Guard recognizes that the OER reinforces command authority by providing a delineation of the lines of authority and responsibility, with officers knowing the members of their rating chains. The system assists commanding officers in delineating lines of authority and responsibility and ensuring common understanding of responsibilities. Finally, the OER is designed to help maintain Coast Guard values and standards. Each officer is evaluated on job achievements but also on common professional values and standards of the Coast Guard, which are defined by the performance scales on the OER.

Background. Coast Guard officer evaluation policy is established by Coast Guard Headquarters, Washington, DC, and implemented by the Office of Personnel, Evaluation Systems Division, located at Headquarters. The Evaluation Systems Division is staffed by one captain (O-6) and one lieutenant commander (O-4). The division has three objectives: (1) to monitor Coast Guard compliance with officer evaluation policy, (2) to continually improve the effectiveness of the Coast Guard officer evaluation system, and (3) to tabulate rating data used to monitor evaluation trends. The division serves as the corporate memory for the Coast Guard's personnel evaluation process and provides a central point for continual review.

In January 1982, after completing a 2-year study of evaluation systems, the Coast Guard implemented the Officer Performance Management System (OPMS). OPMS introduced a new Coast Guard evaluation system based on measuring performance and

individual contributes with behavioral examples as standards of performance. In July 1984, OPMS was replaced by the OER system, which maintained the focus on well-defined standards but reduced several time-consuming and paper-intensive aspects of OPMS.

Distinguishing Features. The primary features of the Coast Guard performance evaluation system are (1) the use of performance standards, (2) the high degree of headquarters' administrative review and quality control, (3) a policy of placing responsibility for managing performance with each individual officer, and (4) the rating chain.

One of the most distinguishing features of the Coast Guard's OER is the use of performance standards, written descriptions of behavior that reflect performance levels within each performance dimension or area. The following is one example of a written description of behavior found in the "Performance of Duties" section on the OER:

Get results which far surpass your expectation in all situations. Own work and that of subordinates is consistently of high quality; never needs redoing. Results have significant positive impact on department and/or unit.

One reason the Coast Guard believes the standards are such a significant feature of the system is that they provide a common frame of reference for rating officers' observed behaviors. The immediate supervisor reviews the officer's performance during the 6-month reporting period and assigns a grade for each performance dimension on the OER. Grades range from 1 (low) to 7 (high). An important element of the Coast Guard system is the policy of comparing an officer's performance and qualities to behavioral standards--not to other officers. Therefore, each officer receives a series of ratings and is not ranked against other officers.

Another distinguishing feature of the Coast Guard's system is its practice of administrative review and quality control. Every OER is reviewed when it is received at Headquarters. OERs with substantive errors or marks not supported by narrative comments and specific examples of performance and qualities are returned to the rater for revision.

A third distinguishing feature is the Coast Guard policy of officer-initiated performance counseling. With the exception of ensigns and lieutenants (junior grade), counseling is optional unless the rated officer or a member of the rating chain requests it. Each officer is responsible for his or her own performance and for getting the counseling that may be needed to measure up to standards.

The rating chain provides the assessment of an officer's performance and value to the Coast Guard through a system of multiple evaluators and reviewers, who, according to the Coast Guard, present independent views and ensure accuracy, timeliness, and correctness of reporting. It reinforces decentralization by placing responsibilities for development and performance evaluation at the lowest levels within the command structure. The reported-on officer is the officer being evaluated. The reported-on officer prepares the administrative portion of the OER and forwards it to the supervisor at least 14 days before the end of the reporting period or occasion for the report. The supervisor is normally the individual the reported-on officer answers to on a daily basis. The supervisor evaluates the performance of the reported-on officer and provides feedback to the reported-on officer if requested. The reporting officer is normally the supervisor's supervisor.

The reporting officer evaluates the reported-on officer's performance, personal qualities and ability to represent the Coast Guard and evaluates the leadership and potential of the reported-on officer for promotion and special assignment, such as command. The reporting officer ensures that the supervisor fully meets the responsibilities for administration of the OER by holding supervisors accountable for accurate evaluations. If a supervisor submits evaluations that are inconsistent with actual performance or unsubstantiated by narrative comments, the reporting officer counsels the supervisor and considers this when grading the supervisor's OER (Section 5 of the OER contains a graded section titled "Evaluating Subordinates--the extent to which an officer conducts, or requires others to conduct, accurate, uninflated, and timely evaluation for enlisted, civilian, and officer personnel"). The reviewer is normally the supervisor of the reporting officer. The reviewer ensures that the supervisor and reporting officer have adequately executed their responsibilities under the OER. The reviewer may return an OER to the reporting officer to correct errors, omissions, or inconsistencies between numerical evaluations and written comments.

Major Evaluation Forms. Two forms are used in the evaluation process: (1) the Officer Evaluation Report (OER) and (2) the Officer Support Form. An example of the former is presented and described in Appendix D.

The OER is four pages long, with a separate form for each grade.

The Officer Support Form is used by either the reported-on officer, the supervisor, or both as an aid in establishing a clear understanding of job expectations and in assisting the supervisor in constructive performance feedback and preparation of proper evaluations. Use of the form is mandatory for supervisors of all reported-on officers of the grades ensign and lieutenant (junior grade) or when a senior member of the rating chain directs that it be used. The Officer Support Form serves as a vehicle for clarifying the reported-on officer's job responsibilities and areas of the job that either the reported-on officer or the supervisor feels should receive emphasis during the reporting period. It serves as a means for the reported-on officer to inform the supervisor if counseling is desired; provides the reported-on officer a means of bringing to the supervisor's attention significant accomplishments; provides a place for the supervisor to note significant accomplishments, shortcomings, behavior, or qualities observed during the period; serves as a vehicle for giving specific, constructive performance feedback; and assists the supervisor and reporting officer in preparing well-substantiated performance evaluations. The form may be used for all grades of officers.

Marine Corps Officer Evaluation System

Purpose. The purpose of the Marine Corps Performance Evaluation System (PES) is to provide essential, accurate information on Marine Corps sergeants and to assist headquarters in making decision on selection and assignment.

Background. The Marine Corps' current PES was implemented in December 1985, after a Marine Corps study reported that extensive grade inflation, if not controlled, would cause the system to become ineffective within the next few years. The study recommended changes to control grade inflation, improve accountability and accuracy of fitness reports, simplify and streamline the evaluation system, and improve the Marine Corps procedure for counseling officers.

Distinguishing Features. The primary distinguishing features of the Marine Corps PES are (1) the ranking of officers, (2) the use of manipulation controls, (3) the separation of counseling from the evaluation report, and (4) the rating chain.

The revised PES requires the reporting senior to rank officers ("1 of 6, 2 of 6," etc.) who are marked "outstanding" in block 15a ("General Value To The Service"). Only Marine officers in the same grade are ranked.

Another distinguishing feature is the use of manipulation controls. Reporting seniors must list alphabetically the names of all reported-on Marines (in a given grade) on the back of all FITREP forms. For example, a reporting senior who reports on eight majors is required to alphabetically list the names of the eight majors on the back of each of the eight fitness reports. This requirement minimizes the opportunity to inflate the number of officers that the rater claims is in the comparison group; thereby contributing to improving the accuracy of the ranking process.

A further distinguishing feature is the Marine Corps' policy to separate performance counseling from the FITREP process. A 1984 Marine Corps study found that simultaneous counseling and fitness report preparation creates a situation in which Marines are more interested in fitness report marks than counseling. The study indicated that when counseling is tied to the report process, it is often slanted toward past efforts rather than toward improving future performance and that it contributes to inflated markings.

The reported-on Marine is the one being evaluated. In the rating chain, the reporting senior is the first officer (or civilian equivalent, GS-11 or above) who is senior in grade to the reported-on Marine and is directly responsible for the primary tasking and supervision of the Marine. The reporting senior is the officer in the best position to observe the Marine's daily performance. The reviewing officer is the second and next senior officer in grade (or civilian equivalent) to the reported-on Marine and is the officer directly responsible for the primary tasking, supervision, and evaluation of the reporting senior.

Major Evaluation Forms. One form, the USMC Fitness Report, is used in the evaluation process. This is presented and described in Appendix E.

Interviews with Industry

During June and July 1985, interviews were conducted with Personnel and Employee Development officers of nine large companies concerning their current practices in the evaluation, development, and promotion of employees. In particular, the interviews were structured to obtain specific information about (1) the mechanics (form, content, etc.) of performance appraisal in the organization, (2) the steps of processes involved in completing an employee evaluation, and (3) the use of appraisal information in the organization. In addition, those interviewed were asked to discuss their organization's approach to career development, job assignment or succession planning, and the links (if any) between performance evaluation and these organizational decisions.

The analysis of the interviews is divided into three sections. In the first section, the common features of performance appraisal systems are identified across the various companies interviewed. Next, these general findings are discussed in relation to the current Navy Officer Fitness Report System. Following the Navy-Industry comparison, the role of organizational performance appraisal information in various personnel decisions is described. The discussion includes the identification of alternative sources and types of information used for such decisions as job assignment and development.

Nine organizations in the East and the Midwest were selected. All organizations had performance appraisal systems in place. Over one half of the organizations had a systematic approach to career planning for individuals as well as long-term succession

planning for the organization. The individuals interviewed in each organization represented the personnel or employee relations function and directly controlled or implemented the personnel appraisal system in their organization. The companies providing the interviews included a major member of the hotel, food, and beverage industry; a leading international supplier of automation and central technology products; a highly diversified producer of commercial and industrial goods and services; and a large, diversified company that manufactures tapes, abrasive materials, drugs, reflective materials, and other products.

Common Features of Performance Evaluation in Selected Companies

Job Scope Descriptions. The careful, complete documentation of the responsibilities of the employee's current position is a key element in performance appraisal in these organizations. The importance that companies place on this factor is reflected by the fact that nearly all of the selected organizations provide a space on the front of the appraisal instrument in which to record specific job scope information. In addition, raters are given training specifically geared toward providing accurate, complete information about the scope of the job held by each employee.

The interviewees suggested four purposes for the job scope statement. First, for the rated employee, it identifies what duties are required. Second, for the rater, it provides reasonably specific information regarding the job. Third, for the rater and the ratee, it provides a management-by-objectives (MBO) basis for performance planning and goal setting. And last, for the organization, documenting employee activities (successive job scope statements) provides critical input on the range of activities and skills that the employee has developed, may need to develop, and so forth. In addition, the information can be used to assess the employee's potential for promotion or assignment into a specific job area by indicating if the individual has had relevant task experience and how well the person has performed in those tasks.

Use of Performance Ratings Rather Than Comparison Rankings. The actual format of appraisal instruments varies from organization to organization. In some companies, MBO-type format or goal setting is used as the basis for evaluation; in other organizations, employees are rated on specific behavioral standards or examples of performance. Although the format varies, all employees are given ratings (high to low, good to bad, etc.) of performance rather than rankings. That is, employees are evaluated against an external set of performance standards rather than against their co-workers or peers.

Multiple Raters in Performance Evaluations. In all of the organizations interviewed, the immediate supervisor is responsible for the observance, evaluation, and documentation of employee performance. The interviewees stated that the immediate supervisor has the greatest day-to-day contact with each subordinate and can most directly and accurately observe the employee's behaviors. Therefore, the immediate supervisor is responsible for completing the performance ratings on each subordinate.

The majority of the organizations interviewed also use second-level supervisory review. The immediate supervisor's supervisor reviews the employee's evaluation and provides modifications or an independent evaluation of the employee. Typically, the immediate supervisor and the second-level supervisor meet to discuss each employee. The immediate supervisor presents the rationale behind specific ratings. If the second-level supervisor believes that the ratings are too high or too low, the ratings are modified accordingly.

The purpose of the second rater in organizations is threefold: (1) This procedure provides a quality check of the immediate supervisor's ratings, (2) there is at least an implicit negative consequence for providing inflated or extremely harsh employee evaluations (i.e., the immediate supervisor will be viewed as unable to effectively evaluate subordinates, which may emerge when the supervisor is under consideration for a promotion), and (3) the second-level rater brings a broader perspective of the employee into the evaluation situation. That is, the second-level rater provides additional information, a different (presumably broader) frame of reference, and a mechanism for monitoring the individual supervisor's ratings.

Rater Training. The organizations provide training to managers that is specifically designed to address rating quality or accuracy and to assist managers in providing performance feedback to employees. In some of the organizations, extensive training time is devoted to the completion of the performance appraisal form itself, to methods for writing performance objectives, to writing an accurate job scope statement, and so forth. The nature of the training format itself varies across the organizations interviewed. In some instances, the training involves a lecture format, with sample appraisal instruments as training exercises; in other instances, managers are provided with on-going training exercises which are to be completed prior to each evaluation process.

Unitary Purpose of Appraisal Information. Similar to the Navy, organizations use performance information for a myriad of personnel decisions, such as salary increases, promotion, job assignments or placement decisions, recommendations for training, dismissals or terminations, and employee performance counseling. Across the nine companies interviewed, the uses of performance appraisal information varied. However, within a given organization, performance information is tied primarily to one personnel decision or practice. In two organizations, performance information is collected to document past and current performance as a basis for salary or merit pay increase recommendations; in another, the performance information provides one input into promotion decisions; and in still another, it is used as a measure to summarize performance for communication between supervisor and employee. In these latter cases, the performance appraisal information is collected and documented by the supervisor, and the employee receives performance feedback and career counseling. That is, the performance information is systematically collected and used, but not by anyone other than the immediate supervisor and the subordinate. The organization uses other information as a basis for such decisions as salary increases, promotion, training recommendations, and succession planning. These other sources of information could include performance-related information, but the information is generally collected via a method other than the performance appraisal instrument.

In summary, although the purpose of collecting performance information varies across organizations, the specific appraisal form is rarely tied to multiple personnel decisions. The organization decides what the primary use is to be and avoids associating the performance appraisal with other, possibly conflicting, decisions.

The Navy Performance Appraisal Process Compared With Industrial Systems

As stated in NAVMILPERSCOMINST 1611.1 (Department of the Navy, 1981), the uses of the Navy's FITREP include promotion decisions, assignment, retention, recommendation for postgraduate training, recommendations for special assignments, and officer performance and career counseling. In reality, the FITREP is used as a basis for each of these decisions. On the other hand, the rater or CO does not have all of these organizational purposes in mind when completing the FITREP. As the interviews with the

COs in the URL, RL, and SC indicate, COs want to convey the promotability of their officers to promotion boards. In addition, in the URL, COs attempt to identify officers who should be the next COs in the Navy. Therefore, the FITREP is completed by the rater from a unitary perspective (i.e., to identify for boards the best and the worst officer candidates for promotion). Further, the trait ratings, the ranking, and the FITREP narrative are completed to be consistent (thus are frequently inflated) with the CO's judgment regarding the officer's promotability. This appears to create some difficulty for the Navy when the FITREP is used as a basis for job assignment decisions or for officer performance counseling. Detailers and specific board members have little unique information about traits, other than general suitability for command, to assist them in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of a given officer.

In some of the organizations interviewed, this would not cause a major problem. One reason is that the performance information gathered is typically used for only one purpose (i.e., promotion) and not for other purposes (e.g., performance counseling). In the Navy, the method for identifying the relative strengths and weaknesses of an officer for job assignments decisions is to look at the trait ratings and the narrative on the officer's FITREP. However, since COs tend to inflate and make all trait ratings alike (in order to get who they want promoted), these ratings provide little useful information about the relative strengths and weaknesses within a given officer. COs simply attempt to distinguish differences between officers for the promotion boards (i.e., identify the "good" officer from the "not so good" ones). In general, promotion and job placement or officer counseling practices are very different decisions and may require different performance information and form. In the Navy, these decisions are related in a general sense, since specific billets at certain career stages are required for promotion. However, the individuals interviewed in industry said that it is essential to use performance information for one clearly identified purpose, not for conflicting, multiple purposes.

Ratings and Rankings of Performance and Promotability. In the Navy, both trait ratings of performance and ranking of officers are used. In industrial organizations, an employee's performance is evaluated by rating the employee in comparison to specific behavioral standards or goals (as in MBO). In organizations, the current performance of an employee is not ranked against all other employees in a given group. However, in some of the organizations interviewed, rankings are used to indicate the promotability of the top three or four employees. This is similar to the Navy policy of ranking all officers (from the rank of lieutenant commander through captain) who are recommended for early promotion. Further, in many of the organizations interviewed, the ranking of promotability is separate from the performance review process; there is frequently a separate form used for this decision. In addition, the employees typically do not know their rankings or promotability rating. The ranking information, then, is used as one input for succession planning or promotion decision. The immediate rater again provides this information to the supervisor. The immediate supervisor evaluates the employee's current performance using trait ratings (low to high) or behavioral ratings. Then on a separate form or in a separate section of the performance appraisal form, the supervisor ranks the employee in terms of readiness for a new position.

This is not unlike the Navy's evaluation process. The Officer Fitness Report includes trait ratings as well as ranking. However, the similarities between industry and the Navy end there. In the organizations interviewed, the employee rankings typically are presented to the supervisor's supervisor. The second-level supervisor can modify these rankings. There is no such check, or "gating," in the Navy system. A second difference is that in the Navy, COs frequently rank from 3 to 30 people within a peer group in a given appraisal period (especially in the URL). COs frequently rank all of their lieutenant

commanders (and above), because the majority of lieutenant commanders are recommended for early promotion and therefore must be ranked against each other in compliance with Navy instructions. In organizations, they do not rank all employees in a given job type, grade, or rank. Supervisors rank only those top three or four employees who are promotable into a particular job area or function (for example, for the immediate supervisor's own job). Therefore, a supervisor in a company generally has fewer employees to evaluate than in the Navy.

Finally, in organizations, individuals are ranked with regard to their suitability for a single, well-defined position. One implication of this procedure is that the top candidate for one position may not be the best for all positions. In contrast, raters in the Navy must rank individuals without considering the unique demands of alternate specific positions for which any one officer may be considered. As an aid, the CO chooses the next job in the hierarchy leading to CO as the benchmark position and evaluates the officer's potential ability to perform that job. There is no evaluation of the officer's potential for positions that are not directly in the required path to CO. The specific requirements (strengths and weaknesses; job duties) of any of the jobs are not considered. In industry, the supervisor must rank the person for one or more alternate positions. In the Navy, the CO ranks the person, without knowing the specific position in which each officer might be placed.

Role of Organizational Performance Evaluation Information in Job Assignments and Succession Planning: Use of Alternative Sources of Information. All of the organizations interviewed have employee-initiated career development programs. That is, if an employee wants to develop or acquire skills in a particular area, the individual can contact the company's career development department to initiate such skill acquisition or development. However, none of the organizations play an active role in the career development of all of its employees. In fact, many of the organizations "track" only a small percentage of high-potential, high-performance employees. The rationale behind this organizational tracking is to develop key individuals in such a way (e.g., via job assignments) that in the long-term they would move into high-level, critical positions in the organization (succession planning).

For job assignment or job promotion decisions, the organizations that were interviewed rely very slightly upon their formal performance evaluation ratings. In fact, the formal performance appraisal plays a relatively minor role in job assignments; instead less formal methods of collecting candidate information are used. However, one critical reorientation should be made at this point. For decisions such as job assignment, promotion, or succession planning, the organization shifts its focus away from the individual (and the evaluation of current performance) to the assessment and analysis of the requirements of a given job or set of jobs. In other words, the focus is upon defining the requirements of a job and the skills necessary to perform the job successfully, rather than determining whether the individual exhibits high or low performance. A great deal of organizational time and effort is devoted to understanding jobs. One reason for this shift in focus (from person to job) is that all of the employees under consideration for these positions have been assessed as high performers with high potential. Therefore, there is less need to distinguish between the good and the poor employees. The question in job assignment or succession planning decisions shifts from "Who are my top performers?" to "Among my top performers, who would be best placed in a job which has these specific set of requirements?" Before the employee or candidate information is considered, the job must be clearly defined.

Job Assignment. Few of the organizations interviewed use the actual ratings from their formal performance appraisal system as a basis for job assignment decisions. If

performance information is used, it is presented in a summary form, reflecting successive past job evaluations, not simply the evaluation in the most immediate position. Job assignment or placement decisions in organizations are based upon multiple sources of information, such as the following:

1. Successive Job Scope Statements. These statements are reviewed for two reasons: first, to determine what the employee has accomplished in jobs which are believed to develop specific skills; and second, to assess whether the individual has developed skills which are pertinent to the new job. The job scope statements are perhaps one of the most critical inputs into the job assignment process. Decision makers try to assess what skills were necessary to successfully perform in past jobs, whether these skills are necessary for the new job, whether necessary skills are sufficiently developed or there is sufficient employee potential to believe that they can be developed.

2. Employee Statement. A second key source of input into job assignment decisions is the employee's personal statement regarding performance, committee involvement, special task force involvement, community activities, and preferences for a position. Some of the organizations interviewed said that there might be a gap or lack of information regarding a skill area for a given individual as reflected in the job scope statements. In addition, a new job might involve a move or a great deal of traveling. Here, the employee's preference statement is consulted.

3. Educational and Technical Background. This source of information includes the documentation of formal education, including technical degrees, continuing education courses, work-related seminars, and workshops. The background of the candidates is reviewed, together with previous job experience and preferences.

4. Peer and Customer Input. When high-performing, high-potential employees are considered for a specific job, many of the organizations interviewed make a concerted effort to contact peers, former peers, supervisors, and customers. The rationale behind this source of information is that peers and clients or customers interact with the candidate under a different set of circumstances and thus may view the employee from a different perspective than the supervisor. The input from peers and clients may add unique information to the decision process that the supervisor may not have access to, or it may supplement supervisory input.

5. Informal Supervisory Input. This source of information involves input from the candidate's past supervisors as well as the current supervisor. In addition, other division heads or supervisors with whom the candidate has interacted are contacted for their input.

All of the above information typically is gathered on each candidate for a given job assignment decision. Much of the information is gathered informally, primarily by the candidate's immediate supervisor. Very little empirical information (performance ratings or promotion rankings) is gathered or used in such decisions.

Methods for Integrating Alternative Sources of Information in Job Assignment Decisions. From the nine companies interviewed, one general method was identified for integrating and synthesizing information used in job assignment decisions. This method is employed in those companies with strong managerial involvement and commitment to the job assignment outcomes. When a job opening is imminent, managers who head the various divisions in the organization meet to discuss the specific requirements of the position. These managers then assess and identify the top candidate within their own

function. Gathering again as a group, the managers present their top candidates for the specific job. Division or function managers comment on their own candidate as well as on other candidates. The organizations that use this method of placing individuals into specific jobs cite a number of advantages: (1) Both the strengths and weakness of each candidate are revealed and explored, (2) the function head must eventually set aside function loyalties in order to place the most qualified and appropriate candidate into the specific position, and (3) the decision makers feel involved and responsible for the consequences of the decisions that they make.

Implications for the Navy

The results of the industry interviews suggest a number of common features of successful performance evaluation and promotion practices. It would be tempting to recommend that the Navy incorporate these common features into the Navy evaluation system. Although some changes can be incorporated without much cost (e.g., the modification of the FITREP form itself), other changes suggest a substantial commitment from the Navy. The following sections compare the Navy with the sampled industries on a number of organizational characteristics. In addition, the possible implications for the Navy of borrowing performance appraisal features directly from organizations are discussed.

Span of Control. In the organizations interviewed, immediate supervisors evaluate subordinates. Therefore, the number of ratees per supervisor is generally small (approximately four to five employees). On the other hand, the CO in the Navy rates officers one, two, or three levels removed, increasing tremendously the sheer volume of evaluations for a given CO. Since supervisors in organizations have fewer subordinates to evaluate and these subordinates report directly to them, the amount of effort and time spent per employee may differ from that which is common in the Navy. Supervisors in organizations appear to have more frequent contact with their subordinates than the Navy COs. In addition, a supervisor generally oversees or supervises a specific employee for 2 to 3 years. On the other hand, COs usually command an officer for approximately 24 months or less.

The Interaction of Supervisors and Subordinates. In the organizations interviewed, there is direct interaction between supervisors and employees, which is in many ways similar to the interaction between COs and their officers. However, in the private sector, there are generally fewer intervening levels or ranks between the employee's job and the supervisor's job. Therefore, raters in industry may know each of their subordinates in greater depth than COs know their officers.

On the other hand, COs and their officers may be more dependent upon each other than supervisors and subordinates are in industry. That is, in the Navy, in order for individuals to work successfully in a given billet, they may need to depend substantially upon another officer or the CO, and vice versa. In many of the Navy commands, the successful completion of a task, an exercise, or a mission depends upon teamwork, not solely upon individual effort or performance. Therefore, the interdependence of the task may place COs in a position where they would get to know many of their officers well.

Tracking. Tracking, or career management, is conducted in order to improve promotion or assignment decisions. In the organizations interviewed, only the careers of a few high-potential employees are tracked systematically within each function. Within divisions or departments (analogous, e.g., to subcommunities within surface and aviation communities), these individuals are identified and tracked up the ladder by division heads

or vice presidents. At this stage, they compete exclusively with employees from within their own divisions. The corporate level of the organization does not become involved until the employee reaches upper management. These upper management employees compete with one another, across all divisions.

In the organizations interviewed, promotion and assignment decisions are very similar. In the Navy, promotion and job assignment are often two distinct organizational decisions. A new job assignment or billet does not automatically mean a promotion from one grade level to the next. In fact, officers will have many different job assignments before coming up for promotion. Further, these different job assignments can be an excellent indicator of whether or not the officer is "on track," or promotable.

In the Navy, both promotion and assignment decisions are centralized and conducted in one location. The promotion boards are statutory boards, required and designed to operate by law. When a specific board meets, for example, to promote to lieutenant commanders, all lieutenants from a class of Navy officers who are eligible are reviewed for promotion by the board. This process is different from industry in two important respects. First, the competition for promotion among officers within a given rank involves very large numbers of people, not just three or four employees at a given time. (This fact can indirectly influence the CO's rating of an officer). Second, the Navy is managing the promotion and assignment of 30,000 to 40,000 officers at a time. There were no similar situations in the organizations interviewed.

Job Hierarchy and Job Assignment. Both in the Navy and in the organizations interviewed, there is a hierarchy of jobs within a given level. That is, there are some "front-runner" positions, which are reserved for the top performers. Further, in the Navy, an officer who has occupied these front-runner positions (called ticket punching) has a greater likelihood of being promoted. This is especially true as officers progress into higher ranks. The difference between the Navy and the companies interviewed is that the companies interviewed also have a hierarchy or sequence of preferred jobs across organizational levels.

In the organizations interviewed, the jobs are well defined. The organization knows that an individual in a particular job will develop or acquire specific skills and in fact may place a person into a job as a means of teaching specific skills needed to progress upward in management. In the Navy, such systematic placement with the specific intent to produce long-term development of specific skills does not occur because it is difficult to assess what skills an officer has developed given a specific configuration of billets and therefore to identify the future sequence of billets that an officer must occupy in order to acquire the specific skills and experience that the Navy may need in the future.

In addition, there is little formal, explicit documentation of skills developed in specific jobs. For example, the Navy desires (and in practice, requires) that URL officers spend some of their career in shore billets, which are informally viewed by officers as less critical than the operational (sea duty) billets. Although the shore billet can develop skills that would be useful for the Navy and for officers later in their careers, the FITREP for these URL officers does not reflect the performance in these billets nor potential to perform well in such billets in the future.

Selection and Promotion From Within. The Navy promotes and assigns officers from within its own ranks. That is, the Navy does not seek nonmilitary personnel to compete for or fill Navy billets. However, in civilian organizations, there frequently is competition among departments within organizations for middle- and top-level employees and new

blood may be brought in from outside. However, all nine organizations interviewed emphasized that they place a high value on the promotion and development of their own employees.

Promotion Process. In the organizations interviewed, promotions are largely the same decisions as assignment decisions. Such decisions are frequently made on a job-by-job basis. On the other hand, in the Navy, promotion and job assignment decisions are frequently independent. Officers are assigned to many billets, while occupying the same organizational level or rank. In addition, the method for making decisions is legally mandated by Congress for the Navy. This is not the case in organizations. A promotion frequently means not only a significant change in job duties, requirements, and responsibilities, but also a step up in the organizational ladder.

Rewards. In the Navy, rewards such as pay increases are largely related to promotion and time in grade, which encourages the officers to remain in the service. Related to promotions, officers may be rewarded for good performance by being assigned to a billet high in the hierarchy. Since billets in the Navy have a specific promotion potential associated with them, the assignment of an officer to such a billet (i.e., having a ticket punched) can be viewed as rewarding. In the organizations interviewed, the general long-term goals include such plans as taking more of the market's profit share, increasing efficiency (i.e., decreasing costs associated with production), and gaining an edge over current competition. On the other hand, the Navy's long-term goals include preparedness and combat readiness.

Literature Review: Criteria for Effective Performance Appraisal Systems

Current research literature on performance evaluation and personnel decision making provided an alternative source of information concerning effective performance appraisal systems. The following discussion presents the most current (and purportedly the most effective) practices in performance evaluation.

A review of the performance evaluation literature identified five common characteristics that influence the effectiveness of the performance appraisal process regardless of which specific format is being used:

1. Has clearly defined, compatible purposes.
2. Is acceptable to the appraisee, the appraisers, the organization, and to society in general.
3. Includes some form of extensive or effective rater training.
4. Provides constructive mutual feedback between the appraiser and the appraisee.
5. Is efficient to administer.

Clearly Defined and Compatible Purposes

Whether or not it is appropriate to use the same performance appraisal information to reach different types of performance-based decisions is an issue that few organizations address. Many performance appraisal systems do not differentiate between intended uses of performance data and implicitly or explicitly collect the same data for all purposes (Mohrman & Lawler, 1981). However, it is inappropriate to base more than one decision on input from the same evaluation source if the types of decisions are not compatible. A

common example of an incompatible use of performance data is the practice of using the same appraisal data as a developmental guide (counseling) and as a basis for promotion decisions. Appraisals that are conducted to determine the award of competitive rewards are ineffective as developmental guides for two reasons: First, feedback of their results generates defensiveness and consequent rejection of the criticism they contain (Kane & Lawler, 1979); and second, the performance data may be inflated to provide support to the individual.

Appraisal data are affected by the intended use of the data. A number of studies have shown that data collected for administrative purposes (pay and promotion decisions) are significantly more lenient than data collected for purposes such as counseling and research (Landy & Farr, 1980; McGregor, 1957; Meyer, Kay, & French, 1965; Sharon & Bartlett, 1969). An effective appraisal system must include an appraisal form for counseling that is independent in form and procedure from the form used to determine promotion or pay matters.

Acceptance of the Performance Appraisal System

For an appraisal system to be effective, it must have the support of the people who are affected by the system. Any performance appraisal system should be acceptable to the appraisee, the appraisers, the organization, and society in general.

There are three factors that influence the appraisee's acceptance of the performance appraisal process. First, it is important that an appraisal system has some face validity; that is, the appraisee must perceive it to be a valid measure of job performance. Second, appraisee participation in the appraisal process is an important factor. The more that appraisees are allowed to voice opinions during the appraisal, the more satisfied they will be with the process (Greller, 1975; Nemeroff & Wexley, 1977; Wexley, Singh, & Yukl, 1973). And third, the degree of support or positive feedback that an appraisee receives from the appraiser during the appraisal event has an influence on the appraisee's acceptance of the appraisal process and satisfaction with the appraiser (Latham & Saari, 1979; Nemeroff & Wexley, 1977).

The appraisers must also be supportive of an appraisal system if the system is to be implemented effectively. Lack of acceptance on the part of an appraiser may result in avoidance of the appraisal process altogether, either by remaining ignorant of the entire process, minimally completing the appraisal forms, or having the employee fill out the appraisal form and then signing the form (Johnson, 1979). Procrastination in the completion of appraisal forms may result from a lack of acceptance of an appraisal system. However, procrastination may occur in a system that does not hold appraisers accountable for tardy or incomplete evaluations.

It is essential that a performance appraisal system be acceptable to the sponsoring organization. If a system fails to provide accurate performance information in a timely fashion, then the system is of no value, regardless of how acceptable the system may be to the organization's employees. An inaccurate or inefficient appraisal system can severely damage an organization's decision-making capabilities.

An appraisal system must be acceptable to society and take account of legal considerations. Performance appraisal, when used for the determination of promotion, falls under the legal restrictions imposed by Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (Kleiman & Durham, 1981). Accordingly, an appraisal system must be able to accurately and quantifiably discriminate between levels of employee performance, be based on consistent standards of measures, and must measure valid indices of job performance.

For an appraisal system to be acceptable to everyone affected by it, especially the appraisee, the appraisal system should include some form of an appeal process that allows appeals to be fairly adjudicated. Due process in an appraisal system serves a variety of purposes. Appraisees see due process features as an additional sign of fairness. Due process features also act to suppress both conscious biases and careless reporting on the part of the appraiser. The knowledge that an appraisal is going to be reviewed both from the organizational and the appraisee's standpoint should increase the perceived probability that an inaccurate report will be detected and corrected (Kane & Lawler, 1979).

Rater Training

Rater training can reduce common psychometric errors such as halo effect and leniency, or grade creep (Bernardin & Pence, 1980; Borresen, 1956; Latham & Wexley, 1981). Rater training is particularly effective when training is extensive and allows for rater practice (Landy & Farr, 1980). The effect of rater training on the accuracy, or validity, of performance appraisals has not received much research, and the results are mixed. Borman (1979) found that rater training produced no difference in the accuracy of the appraisal. Pulakos (1984) found that by instructing appraisers on the meanings of performance dimensions and on what types of behaviors are appropriate within performance dimensions, appraisal accuracy can in fact be improved. The accuracy of appraisals is influenced more by the intended purpose of the appraisal than by the effects of rater training (Zedeck & Cascio, 1982).

Effective Mutual Feedback

Constructive mutual feedback between supervisor and subordinate is an essential component of effective personnel appraisal systems that have performance improvement or development planning as goals. Performance feedback changes behavior to the extent that the feedback recipient accurately perceives, accepts, and responds to the information provided in the feedback (Ilgen, Fisher, Taylor, 1979). Discussing problems that may be hampering a subordinate's current job performance and working toward solutions has had immediate effects on productivity (Maier, 1958; Meyer & Kay, 1964). Caution must be exercised so that the feedback provided by a supervisor is not overly critical of the subordinate's performance, because the number of criticisms in an appraisal correlates with the number of defensive actions shown by the employee. Those areas that are most criticized are least likely to show improvement (Kay, Meyer, & French, 1965; Nemeroff & Wexley, 1977).

However, the different roles required to support individual improvement and to evaluate individual potential for promotion or achievement for compensation must be split apart (Meyer, Kay, & French, 1965). Therefore, at least two appraisal systems need to be developed to cover the different purposes and appraisal outcomes. One of those systems should have the mutual feedback characteristic present, while the other should not.

System Efficiency

To be effective, a personnel appraisal system must be efficient to administer. The efficiency of a performance appraisal system is influenced by (1) the format of the appraisal instrument, (2) the timing of the appraisal event, and (3) the source of appraisal information.

Appraisal Format. An efficient appraisal system must include an appraisal form that is concise and easy to use or appraisors will not use it. It, however, must be complete

enough to satisfy the critical objectives of the appraisal. The appraisal form itself is at the root of many ineffective performance appraisal systems. Forms that require a great deal of time to complete or are exhaustive in detail undermine the appraisal process (Johnson, 1979). For example, once the number of dimensions exceeds nine, only additional redundant information is being provided (Kafry, Jacobs, & Zedeck, 1979). The overall impact that the format of the appraisal instrument has on the level of accuracy of an appraisal system seems to be in question. The format of the appraisal form has little if any effect on the results produced by the appraisal event (Borman, 1979; Lawler, Mohrman, & Resnick, 1983). Thus the format of the appraisal instrument is important to getting the form completed but not as critical to the accuracy of the appraisal.

The structure of the narrative section of an appraisal form may have an impact on the reliability of the narrative. By structuring the narrative section according to specific topics, such as performance of administrative duties, the appraiser's attention is focused on that specific quality. Topics to be included in the narrative section are determined through a content analysis of the job.

Time of Evaluation. The timing of the performance appraisal event is a major factor in the efficiency of an appraisal system. Appraisals should be conducted as required to meet organizational goals and to provide timely feedback to the appraisee. Few studies have addressed the issue of appraisal timing. Kane and Lawler (1979) made some suggestions as how best to schedule appraisals, however their suggestions deal mainly with providing the appraisee with timely feedback and do not address the need for providing the organization with timely input. For an organization to make efficient use of performance appraisal information, it must have access to current information at the time that performance-based decisions are being made.

Source of Evaluation Information. The source of the evaluation data also affects the efficiency of the appraisal system. Performance evaluations should be conducted by a superior who has adequate job knowledge and access to an appraisee. However, most appraisal systems call for the appraisee's immediate supervisor to make performance evaluations. This practice is not always advisable because an employee's hierarchical superior may not always have direct access to, direct information about, or expertise in the job performance of the appraisee (Mohrman & Lawler, 1981). This issue is particularly relevant to the Navy's evaluation system, where the CO of a unit is traditionally responsible for the completion of each fitness report. This practice may affect the accuracy of the Navy's evaluation process because raters who are not especially knowledgeable about the technical aspects of the task tend to be more lenient (Wagner & Hoover, 1974). To accurately appraise job performance, evaluation should be conducted by a superior who had adequate job knowledge and access to the appraisee.

CONCLUSIONS

Navy Interviews

FITREP Purpose

As written in the NAVMILPERSCOMINST 1611.1 instructions to COs (Department of the Navy, 1981), the Navy states that the Fitness Report will be used for 10 purposes: promotion, assignment, retention, selection for command, selection for subspecialty, term of service, professional development training, other career actions as required, counseling junior officers, and reporting extraordinary performance. In fact, the Navy uses the

FITREP information for each of these purposes. However, interviews with reporting seniors across Navy communities indicate that a reporting CO's primary purpose in completing the FITREP is to express to promotion boards an evaluation of an officer's promotability. The officers interviewed believe the FITREP is an effective device for recommending or not recommending a promotion. When completing the FITREP, other purposes attributed to the FITREP are viewed as secondary. The FITREP's effectiveness for these other purposes is questionable. To obtain accurate and useful information about officers for decisions other than promotion, the information should be derived from sources not tied to the promotion process.

The FITREP's Role in Job Assignment

FITREP information aids detailers in the job assignment process. Ideally, detailers should have an accurate assessment of an officer's strengths and weaknesses (qualities, job skills, performance, and potential) in order to assign the most qualified officer to a specific job. However, the FITREP does not portray an accurate assessment of an officer's strengths and weaknesses. As a result, detailers assign officers to jobs by matching the officer's promotability (derived from the FITREP) with the quality of the job, quality determined by a well-established job hierarchy.

Ratings as Discriminators

Ratings, letter grades from A through I, are assigned in 25 areas (grading boxes) on the front of the FITREP form. The purpose of these grades, as stated in NAVMILPERS-COMINST 1611.1, is to identify an officer's strengths as well as "areas requiring greater emphasis" (or weaknesses). Reporting seniors, however, do not assign letter grades to describe an officer's strengths and weaknesses. Reporting seniors assign grades consistent with the promotion outcome they desire. Reporting seniors know that promotion boards view Bs (or lower grades) as a significant negative statement concerning an officer's promotability. As a result, reporting officers usually assign all As to officers they regard as promotable.

Inflation

Each of the United States military performance appraisal systems in use today is supported by a method to control inflated appraisals. The Navy's method is peer ranking. Peer ranking has been in use, accepted by the officer corps, and effective for many years. Peer ranking is currently limited to the ranks of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain. The Navy discontinued ranking ensigns, lieutenants (junior grade), and lieutenants in 1979.

Though ranking is an effective discriminator, there are three problems in the current implementation:

1. Lieutenants and below are not ranked. Detailers and selection board members believe that ranking these officers would add needed discrimination to the job assignment and promotion processes.
2. There is a high occurrence of "1 of 1" rankings. These "1 of 1" rankings are more frequent in the RL, SC, and submarine communities--because of their relatively small number of officers--than in the surface or aviation communities. Two factors help compensate for "1 of 1" rankings in the smaller communities: An officer's community reputation helps (or hinders) the chance of assignment to a key billet; and reporting

seniors provide detailers with a candid assessment of an officer's potential via well-structured, yet informal, communication processes.

3. Manipulation of rankings by a few reporting seniors subtracts from the overall effectiveness and fairness of the ranking process.

Despite these shortcomings, the Navy's ranking system appears to be an effective control of inflation in the FITREP process.

Candid Assessment--An Aid to the Job Assignment Process

It is unlikely that the current FITREP process will ever provide a candid assessment of an officer's strengths and weaknesses to the degree necessary for detailers to assign the "right officer to the right job." The FITREP's failure to provide a candid assessment is due to reporting seniors' reluctance (throughout the history of the FITREP) to report minor weaknesses for fear of hurting an officer's chance for promotion. However, a candid assessment might be possible if it was not tied to the promotion process and if the information was not seen by promotion board members.

Interviews with Other Military Services and Industry

The following conclusions draw on similarities noted across the interviews with other military services and selected industry. Each conclusion may not represent all of those interviewed but does represent this group as a whole.

Purpose of Performance Information

Based on the military and the industrial interviews, performance information should be used for either a single decision (e.g., promotion) or for compatible decisions. One way to determine the primary purpose for which the performance information should be used is to ask raters what they think about when completing the form. If there is consensus, it seems most reasonable to use the information for the purposes that the raters intended rather than for multiple incompatible purposes.

For decisions other than what the rater intended, supplemental information or separate forms should be used. For example, if the performance appraisal is primarily used as a basis for promotion decisions, then performance counseling should be a separate function. The counseling process, the forms used, and the time at which it is conducted, should all be as distinct as possible from the forms and process used in promotion decisions. The use of alternative sources of information and different forms for conveying that information was particularly prevalent in the organizations interviewed.

Explicit Documentation of Job Scope

Most of the military services and civilian organizations interviewed have a very detailed, explicit documentation of the duties, responsibilities, and skills required for each job title. The importance that these organizations place on an accurately completed job scope description is clearly reflected by the fact that a space is provided on the top of the front page of their performance evaluation forms. Further, in one organization, the job scope description includes the employee's budget size, the number of employees supervised, special projects and accomplishments, and so on. Once this is specified, decision makers may look at two similar or identical job titles and determine which employee possesses greater responsibility or has more fully developed specific skills. Further, the

organizations that were interviewed provide training for employees to complete the job description information accurately and completely.

Performance Appraisal Training

The Air Force provides raters with mock promotion board training. Personnel representatives who were interviewed in organizations stated that considerable time and resources are devoted to training supervisors to accurately and completely document information on performance appraisal forms.

Summary

1. Reporting seniors have a single purpose--to identify promotable officers and those who should be assigned to key billets that lead to promotion.
2. The FITREP appears to effectively convey an officer's promotability to promotion boards and detailers.
3. The FITREP does not provide a candid assessment of an officer's strengths and weaknesses (and it probably cannot).
4. Ranking is an effective inflation control and is accepted by the officer corps. Ranking lieutenants would provide selection boards and detailers with discrimination that does not now exist.
5. Adding grade boxes will not add additional information on performance that will help boards and detailers with their decisions because reporting seniors assign grades to indicate an officer's promotability rather than to delineate specific strengths and weaknesses.
6. FITREPs seldom include an adequate description of the scope of an officer's job.
7. The narrative is often poorly written and often contains information that is not useful to selection boards and detailers.
8. First-tour COs want training on how to write more effective FITREPs.
9. A counseling system that is not tied to the FITREP would be more effective.
10. Manipulation is a problem.
11. The officer corps is not calling for a major change in the FITREP.

RECOMMENDATIONS

General Recommendations

Based on the findings of the interviews with the Navy, other military services, and selected industry, the following are recommended for the Navy:

1. Purpose of the Navy FITREP. The information on the Navy FITREP should be used primarily for promotion decisions. According to the Navy COs, the FITREP is completed with the promotion purpose in mind. It may also be appropriate to use FITREP

information when a given decision, such as job assignment, requires an evaluation of the officer's potential for promotion or for taking on greater responsibility within the career path that leads to CO.

2. Supplemental FITREP Information. For decisions that largely do not involve the evaluation of the officer's promotability, information obtained from sources other than the FITREP should be used. Further, this information should not come from the COs, who associate the FITREP with promotion decisions. COs play a central part in the promotion process by providing the information used in promotions. If current COs were asked to identify strengths and weaknesses of their officers in order to make better job assignment decisions, for example, it would be very likely that they would be mindful of how this information would affect the officer's promotion opportunities and would de-emphasize the officer's weaknesses and overestimate strengths.

In the Army and in selected industry, the education and training background of officers and employees is documented and clearly conveyed to decision makers. Information on educational and acquired skills and experience should be provided to the Navy board members who make postgraduate school and subspecialty recommendations. Further, this information can be used to assist detailers in determining which officers should be assigned to specific billets.

3. Effective FITREP Completion. The Navy should provide COs with training in the completion of the FITREP. Specifically, COs realize that promotion board members look for specific terms or phrases that discriminate the excellent officers ("water walkers") from the poor or average officers ("looks good in his uniform"). COs also realize that phrases that convey outstanding performance in their own community may not reflect the same thing in other communities. The COs in the URL (aviation, surface, subsurface, and general URL), the RL, and the SC would like a formal training program to learn how to standardize these key phrases across the communities.

COs also stated that they would benefit from training on effective structuring of the narrative. Should the narrative be written in bullet or paragraph format? What length should the narrative be? What areas of the officer's job, current performance, or potential should the narrative cover? COs believe that the quality of the narrative could be improved with more formal training.

4. Format of the FITREP. The Navy should incorporate a structured job scope description into the FITREP. A research study could determine the specific structure and content of the description. Further, COs recommended that the usefulness of boxes 60 and 61 (Joint/OSD and Foreign Shore) on the FITREP be assessed by more focused discussions with COs. COs indicated that they do not fully understand how to respond to these boxes. In addition, discussions with COs would provide an opportunity to identify valuable information regarding the officer's potential for promotion that is currently not on the FITREP.

Specific Recommendations

1. Rank lieutenants recommended for early promotion.
2. Include a thorough description of the scope of an officer's job on the FITREP.
3. Define the narrative format.

4. Establish procedures to stop manipulation.
5. Design FITREP training for first-tour COs.
6. Design a separate method to identify an officer's strengths and weaknesses.
7. Design a counseling system that is separate from the FITREP.

REFERENCES

- Benardin, H. J., & Pence, E. C. (1980). The effects of rater training: Creating new response sets and decreasing accuracy. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 60-66.
- Borman, W. C. (1979). Format and training effects on rating accuracy and rating errors. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 410-421.
- Borresen, H. A., (1956). The effects of instructions and item content on three types of ratings. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 27, 855-862.
- Department of the Navy (1981, May). Report on the fitness of officers (NAVMILPERS-COM Instruction 1611.1). Washington, D.C: Author.
- Greller, M. M. (1975). Subordinate participation and reaction to the appraisal interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 18, 544-549.
- Ilgen, D. R., Fisher, C. D., & Taylor, M. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 349-371.
- Johnson, R. G. (1979). The appraisal interview guide. New York: AMACOM.
- Kafry, D., Jacobs, R., & Zedeck, S. (1979). Discriminability in multidimensional performance evaluations. Applied Psychological Measurement, 3 (2), 187-192.
- Kane, J. S., & Lawler, E. E. (1979). Performance appraisal effectiveness: Its assessment and determinants. Research in Organizational Behavior, 1, 425-477.
- Kay, E., Meyer, H. H., & French, J. R. P., Jr. (1965). Effects of threat in a performance appraisal interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 311-317.
- Kleiman, L. S., & Durham, R. L. (1981). Performance appraisal and the courts: A critical review. Personnel Psychology, 34, 103-121.
- Landy, F. J., & Farr, J. L. (1980). Performance rating. Psychological Bulletin, 87, 72-107.
- Larson, G. E., & Rimland, B. (1984). Officer performance evaluation systems: Lessons learned from experience (NPRDC TR 85-6). San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
- Latham, G. P., & Saari, L. M. (1979). The importance of supportive relationships in goal setting. Journal of Applied Psychology, 164, 163-168.
- Latham, G. P., & Wexley, K. N. (1981). Increasing productivity through performance appraisal. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Lawler, E. E., Mohrman, A. M., Jr., & Resnick, S. M. (1983). Performance appraisal revisited (Tech. Rep. No. 83-7; Contract N-00014-81-K-0048). Arlington, VA: Office of Naval Research.
- Maier, N. R. F. (1958). The appraisal interview: Objectives, methods, and skills. London: Wiley.

- McGregor, D. (1957). An uneasy look at performance appraisal. Harvard Business Review, 53, 89-94.
- Meyer, H. H., & Kay, E. A. (1964). Comparison of a work planning program with the annual performance appraisal interview approach (Behavioral Res. Rep. No. ESR 17). General Electric Company.
- Meyer, H. H., Kay, E. A., & French, J. R. P., Jr. (1965). Split roles in performance appraisal. Harvard Business Review, 43, 123-129.
- Mohrman, A. M. Jr., & Lawler, E. E. (1981). Motivation and performance appraisal behavior (Tech. Rep. No. 81-13; Contract N-00014-81-K-0048). Arlington, VA: Office of Naval Research.
- Nemeroff, W. F., & Wexley, K. N. (1977). Relationships between performance appraisal interview outcomes by supervisors and subordinates. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Orlando, FL.
- Pulakos, E. D. (1984). A comparison of rater training programs: Error training and accuracy training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 581-588.
- Sharon, A. T., & Bartlett, C. J., (1969). Effect of instructional conditions in producing leniency on two types of rating scales. Personnel Psychology, 22 (3), 251-263.
- Wagner, E. E., & Hoover, T. O. (1974). Effects of terminal ranking error on meaningful occupational choice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 247-248.
- Wexley, K. N., Singh, J. P., & Yukl, G. A. (1973). Subordinate personality as a moderator of the effects of participation in three types of appraisal interviews. Journal of Applied Psychology, 58, 54-59.
- Zedeck, S., & Cascio, W. F. (1982). Performance appraisal decisions as a function of rater training and purpose of the appraisal. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 752-758.

APPENDIX A
NAVY OFFICER FITNESS REPORT

ALIGN FIRST CHARACTER IN THIS BOX

TYPE THE WORD ALIGN TO REGISTER HERE

SUPERS USE ONLY

P1611-1

SUPERS USE ONLY

03

REPORT ON THE FITNESS OF OFFICERS

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1 NAME (LAST FIRST MIDDLE) | | | | 2 GRADE | | 3 DESIG | | 4 SSN | |
| 5 ACBUTMA TEMAC | | 6 UIC | | 7 SHIP/STATION | | 8 DATE REPORTED | | | |
| 9 OCCASION FOR REPORT PERIODIC | | | | 10 DETACHMENT OF REPORTING SENIOR | | 11 DETACHMENT OF OFFICER | | 12 PERIOD OF REPORT FROM | |
| 13 TO | | 14 REG ULAR | | 15 CON CURRENT | | 16 SPE CIAL | | 17 OPS CDR | |
| 18 BASIS FOR OBSERVATION CLOSE | | | | 19 FRE QUENT | | 20 INFRE QUENT | | 21 EMPLOYMENT OF COMMAND (CONTINUED ON REVERSE SIDE OF RECORD COPY) | |
| 22 DAYS OF COM BAT | | | | 23 REPORTING SENIOR (LAST NAME FI MI) | | 24 TITLE | | 25 GRADE | |
| 26 DESIG | | | | 27 SSN | | 28 DUTIES ASSIGNED (CONTINUED ON REVERSE SIDE OF RECORD COPY) | | | |
| 29 SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF PERFORMANCE (TYPE IN OCR CODE LETTER FROM WORK SHEET) | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 GOAL SETTING & ACHIEVEMENT | | 31 SUBORDINATE MAN AGEMENT & DEVELOPMENT | | 32 WORKING RELATIONS | | 33 EQUIP & WATER MANAGEMENT | | 34 NAVY OR GAN. SUPPORT | |
| 35 RESPONSE IN STRESSFUL SITUATIONS | | 36 EQUAL OPPORTUNITY | | 37 SPEAKING ABILITY | | 38 WRITING ABILITY | | 39 WARFARE SPECIALTY SKILLS (FROM OUR WORK SHEET) | |
| 40 SEA MANSHIP | | 41 AIR MANSHIP | | 42 WATCH STANDING | | 43 UTILIZATION | | 44 SUBSPECIALTY CODE | |
| 45 YES | | 46 NO | | 47 FRE QUENT | | 48 INFRE QUENT | | 49 NONE | |
| 50 PERFORM ANCE | | 51 MARG | | 52 UNSAT | | 53 FIRST REPORT | | 54 CON SISTENT | |
| 55 IMPROVING | | 56 DECLINING | | 57 COM MAND | | 58 OPERA TIONAL | | 59 JOINT OSC | |
| 60 FOREIGN SHORE | | 61 EARLY PROMOTION | | 62 REG ULAR | | 63 NO | | 64 NUMBER RECOMMENDED | |
| 65 RANKING | | 66 PERSONAL TRAIT (TYPE IN OCR CODE FROM WORK SHEET) | | 67 JUDG MENT | | 68 IMAGIN ATION | | 69 ANALYTIC ABILITY | |
| 70 PERSONAL BEHAVIOR | | 71 FORCE FULNESS | | 72 MILITARY BEARING | | 73 WEAKNESSES DISCUSSED | | 74 YES | |
| 75 NO | | 76 STATEMENT BC NOT DESIRED | | 77 ATTACHED | | 78 SIGNATURE OF OFFICER EVALUATED (HAW SUPERS INST 1611.12 SERIES 1 ACKNOWLEDGE THAT I HAVE SEEN THIS REPORT HAVE BEEN APPRISED OF MY PER FORMANCE AND RIGHT TO MAKE A STATEMENT) | | 79 DATE FORWARDED | |
| 80 | | 81 SIGNATURE OF REPORTING SENIOR | | 82 DATE FORWARDED | | 83 | | 84 SIGNATURE OF REGULAR REPORTING SENIOR ON CONCURRENT AND CONCURRENT SPECIAL REPORT | |
| 85 | | 86 | | 87 | | 88 | | 89 | |

NAVJAG 1611.1 (REV 6-77) BN 0106-LF-016-1100

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1984-421 329 2 2040

WORK SHEET

DETACH WORK SHEET BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

Comments are required. Enter comments in Section 88 on RECORD OFFICER and REPORTING SENIOR'S copies.
DO NOT ATTACH CONTINUATION PAGES TO OCR COPY

APPENDIX B
AIR FORCE OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT FORM

AIR FORCE OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT FORM

Section 1 - Officer Background Data. The first section contains administrative data, such as name, grade, and period of the report.

Section 2 - Job Description. A detailed description of the ratee's duties and responsibilities is completed by the rater. Air Force regulations specify that the description of the ratee's job must "make the ratee come alive for the user" and make clear the degree of assignment selectivity involved and the responsibility exercised, as well as the nature of the tasks performed by the ratee. Raters are directed to include specific aspects of the ratee's job, such as the dollar value of projects managed, number of people supervised, level to which responsible, and equipment and material responsible for.

Section 3 - Performance Factors. A list of 10 performance factors, such as job knowledge, judgment and decisions, and leadership, is assessed by checking one of five boxes ranging from "far below standard" through "well above standard." These 10 performance factors are rated by three evaluators, the rater, additional rater, and indorser; but only the rater provides specific word justification in each block. Written performance standards for each factor have been established for all grades and jobs.

Section 4 - Next Assignment. A space is provided for a recommendation for the next assignment. It includes identification of the ratee's strongest ability or talents, a recommendation for the next assignment, a recommendation of when the ratee should be assigned the new job and whether the ratee should attend a service school before the recommended job assignment.

Section 5 - Evaluation of Potential. This section of the form consists of six points on a scale that reflects ratings from "lowest" to "highest" potential. (The percentage of officers who could be marked in the top three boxes was controlled from 1974 to 1978.) At each of the six points, there is a box that is sectioned into three parts, allowing the rater, an additional rater, and an indorser the opportunity to evaluate the officer's potential. The evaluators assign a rating of potential by checking their assigned section in one of the six boxes. "Potential" is defined as the ratee's capability for assuming increased responsibilities as compared to other officers of the same grade known by the evaluator. Primary consideration is given to performance within the reporting period. However, factors such as experience, scope and responsibility of the job, and education are also considered.

Section 6 - Rater Comments. Approximately 2 inches of space is provided on the form for rater's comments. Raters are expected to describe the officer's potential rather than to list adjectives to describe the officer. They are instructed to avoid headings, underlining, or capitalizing merely to add emphasis. Officers do have specific instructions to follow when completing Section 6.

Section 7 - Additional Rater Comments. Below the rater's comments, space is provided for the additional rater to indicate agreement or disagreement with the rater's evaluation. Furthermore, the additional rater must check a concur or nonconcur box indicating agreement or disagreement.

Section 8 - Indorser Comments. A space identical to Section 7 is provided for the indorser to make specific comments about the officer. Comments are optional in Sections 6, 7, and 8 unless the indorser has significant disagreement with any part of the evaluation. However, in almost all reports, comments are provided in these sections despite their optional nature.

I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA (*Read AFR 36-10 carefully before filling in any item!*)

| | | | |
|---|--------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. NAME (Last, First, Middle Initial) | 2. SSN | 3. GRADE | 4. DAFSC |
| 5. ORGANIZATION, COMMAND, LOCATION | | | 6. PAS CODE |
| 7. PERIOD OF REPORT FROM: THRU: | | 8. NO. DAYS OF SUPER-VISION | 9. REASON FOR REPORT |

| |
|---|
| II. JOB DESCRIPTION 1. DUTY TITLE: 2. KEY DUTIES, TASKS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES: |
|---|

| III. PERFORMANCE FACTORS <i>Specific example of performance required</i> | NOT OBSERVED | FAR BELOW STANDARD | BELOW STANDARD | MEETS STANDARD | ABOVE STANDARD | WELL ABOVE STANDARD |
|---|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
|---|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. JOB KNOWLEDGE(<i>Depth, currency, breadth</i>) | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. JUDGMENT AND DECISIONS(<i>Consistent, accurate, effective</i>) | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. PLAN AND ORGANIZE WORK(<i>Timely, creative</i>) | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES(<i>Manpower, materiel, fiscal</i>) | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. LEADERSHIP(<i>Initiative, accept responsibility</i>) | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. ADAPTABILITY TO STRESS(<i>Stable, flexible, dependable</i>) | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. ORAL COMMUNICATION(<i>Clear, concise, confident</i>) | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION(<i>Clear, concise, organized</i>) | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES(<i>Attitude, dress, cooperation, bearing</i>) | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. HUMAN RELATIONS(<i>Equal opportunity participation, sensitivity</i>) | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| IV. ASSIGNMENT RECOMMENDATION: 2. SUGGESTED JOB (Include AFSC) 3. ORGANIZATION LEVEL: | 1. STRONGEST QUALIFICATION: 4. TIMING: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| V. EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL: <p><i>Compare the ratee's capability to assume increased responsibility with that of other officers whom you know in the same grade. Indicate your rating by placing an "X" in the designated portion of the most appropriate block.</i></p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: flex-end;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td></tr> </table> <p>RATER ADDN RATER INDORS-ER</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td></tr> </table> <p>RATER ADDN RATER INDORS-ER</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td></tr> </table> <p>RATER ADDN RATER INDORS-ER</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td><td style="width: 33px; height: 33px;"></td></tr> </table> <p>RATER ADDN RATER INDORS-ER</p> </div> </div> <div style="margin-top: 10px;"> <p style="text-align: left;">← Lowest</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Highest →</p> </div> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

VI. RATER COMMENTS

| | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| NAME, GRADE, BR OF SVC, ORGN, COMD, LOCATION | DUTY TITLE | DATE |
| | SSAN | SIGNATURE |

VII. ADDITIONAL RATER COMMENTS

☐ CONCUR ☐ NONCONCUR

| | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| NAME, GRADE, BR OF SVC, ORGN, COMD, LOCATION | DUTY TITLE | DATE |
| | SSAN | SIGNATURE |

VIII. INDORSER COMMENTS

☐ CONCUR ☐ NONCONCUR

| | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| NAME, GRADE, BR OF SVC, ORGN, COMD, LOCATION | DUTY TITLE | DATE |
| | SSAN | SIGNATURE |

APPENDIX C
ARMY OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT

ARMY OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT (DA 67-8)

A major source of information used in the completion of the Army Officer Evaluation Report (OER) is the Officer Evaluation Report Support Form (DA 67-8-1). The support form is completed as part of a management by objectives program and does not become part of the officer's personnel file.

Sections 1 and 2 - Administrative Data and Authentication. Administrative information such as the names of the ratee and the officers in the rating chain, the ratee's date of rank, designated specialties, and unit are recorded and verified.

Section 3 - Duty Description. On the front of the Officer Evaluation Report (OER) a 1-½-inch space is provided for the rater/immediate supervisor to record a detailed description of the rated officer's duties. Raters receive training to emphasize specific functions required of the rated officer and to note conditions peculiar to the assignment.

Section 4(a) - Performance Evaluation (Professional Competence). Fourteen attributes are listed defining professionalism in the Army. The immediate supervisor rates the officers on each attribute using a 5-point rating scale. A rating of "1" reflects the best performance, while a rating of "5" reflects the worst performance.

Section 4(b) - Performance Evaluation (Professional Ethics). A narrative space is provided for rater comments on any area where the officer is particularly outstanding or needs improvement. Furthermore, at the left-hand side of the space is a list of eight adjectives reflecting professional ethics. The rater is instructed to use these adjectives as guidelines in describing each officer.

Section 5 - Performance and Potential Evaluation. The rater is required to make two judgments in section 5. First, the rater evaluates the officers on a 5-point (box) scale on performance during a specific rating period (current assignment). The scale anchors range from "always exceeded requirements" to "usually failed requirements." The rater is also provided with a 3-inch space to specifically comment on the officers current accomplishments.

Second, in Section 5, the rater is requested to rate the officer's potential for promotion using a 3-point (box) scale. The anchors on the potential-for-promotion scale are "promote ahead of contemporaries," "promote with contemporaries," and "do not promote." There is a fourth box identified as "other." The rater is again provided with a space to comment on the officer's promotability.

Section 6 - Intermediate Rater. A small narrative section is provided for the intermediate rater's evaluation of performance and potential.

Section 7 - Senior Rater. A key consideration in promotion is the evaluation of officer potential provided by the senior rater in Section 7. The senior rater's evaluation is made by comparing the rated officer's potential with all other officers of the same grade. The evaluation is based on the premise that in a representative sample of 100 officers of the same grade, the relative potential of such a sample will approximate a bell-shaped normal distribution pattern. This distribution pattern is depicted by a bell-shaped diagram of 100 soldiers on the senior rater's portion of the OER. The senior rater makes the potential evaluation by placing an "X" in the appropriate box of the "SR" column. A comments section is provided for the senior rater to discuss the actual rating.

OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT SUPPORT FORM

For use of this form, see AR 623-105; the proponent agency is DCSPER.

*Read Privacy Act Statement on Reverse before Completing this form***PART I - RATED OFFICER IDENTIFICATION**

NAME OF RATED OFFICER (Last, First, MI)

GRADE

ORGANIZATION

PART II - RATING CHAIN - YOUR RATING CHAIN FOR THE EVALUATION PERIOD IS:

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------|-------|----------|
| RATER | NAME | GRADE | POSITION |
| INTERMEDIATE RATER | NAME | GRADE | POSITION |
| SENIOR RATER | NAME | GRADE | POSITION |

PART III - VERIFICATION OF INITIAL FACE-TO-FACE DISCUSSION

AN INITIAL FACE-TO-FACE DISCUSSION OF DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR THE CURRENT RATING PERIOD TOOK PLACE ON _____

RATED OFFICER'S INITIALS _____ RATER'S INITIALS _____

PART IV - RATED OFFICER (Complete a, b, and c below for this rating period)**a. STATE YOUR SIGNIFICANT DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

DUTY TITLE IS _____, THE POSITION CODE IS _____

b. INDICATE YOUR MAJOR PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

LIST YOUR SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS

SIGNATURE AND DATE

PART V - RATER AND/OR INTERMEDIATE RATER (Review and comment on Part IVa, b, and c above.
Insure remarks are consistent with your performance and potential evaluation on DA Form 67-8.)

a. RATER COMMENTS (Optional)

SIGNATURE AND DATE (Mandatory)

b. INTERMEDIATE RATER COMMENTS (Optional)

SIGNATURE AND DATE (Mandatory)

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a)

1. AUTHORITY: Sec 301 Title 5 USC; Sec 3012 Title 10 USC.

2. PURPOSE: DA Form 67-8, Officer Evaluation Report, serves as the primary source of information for officer personnel management decisions. DA Form 67-8-1, Officer Evaluation Support Form, serves as a guide for the rated officer's performance, development of the rated officer, enhances the accomplishment of the organization mission, and provides additional performance information to the rating chain.

3. ROUTINE USE: DA Form 67-8 will be maintained in the rated officer's official military Personnel File (OMPF) and Career Management Individual File (CMIF). A copy will be provided to the rated officer either directly or sent to the forwarding address shown in Part I, DA Form 67-8. DA Form 67-8-1 is for organizational use only and will be returned to the rated officer after review by the rating chain.

4. DISCLOSURE: Disclosure of the rated officer's SSN (Part I, DA Form 67-8) is voluntary. However, failure to verify the SSN may result in a delayed or erroneous processing of the officer's OER. Disclosure of the information in Part IV, DA Form 67-8-1 is voluntary. However, failure to provide the information requested will result in an evaluation of the rated officer without the benefits of that officer's comments. Should the rated officer use the Privacy Act as a basis not to provide the information requested in Part IV, the Support Form will contain the rated officer's statement to that effect and be forwarded through the rating chain in accordance with AR 623-105.

PART I - ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------------|---------------|--|-------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| a. LAST NAME FIRST NAME MIDDLE INITIAL | | | b. SSN | c. GRADE | d. DATE OF BIRTH Year Month Day | e. BR | f. DESIGNATED SPECIALTIES | g. PMOS/MO | h. STA CODE |
| i. UNIT, ORGANIZATION, STATION, ZIP CODE OR APO, MAJOR COMMAND | | | | | j. REASON FOR SUBMISSION | | | k. COMO CODE | |
| l. PERIOD COVERED FROM Year Month Day THRU Year Month Day | | | m. NO OF MONTHS | n. MILPO CODE | o. RATED OFFICER COPY (check one and date) <input type="checkbox"/> 1 GIVEN TO OFFICER <input type="checkbox"/> 2 FORWARDED TO OFFICER | | | p. FORWARDING ADDRESS | |
| q. EXPLANATION OF NONRATED PERIODS | | | | | | | | | |

PART II - AUTHENTICATION (Rated officer signature verifies PART I data and RATING OFFICIALS ONLY)

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| a. NAME OF RATER (Last, First, MI) | | b. SSN | c. SIGNATURE |
| d. GRADE, BRANCH, ORGANIZATION, DUTY ASSIGNMENT | | e. DATE | |
| f. NAME OF INTERMEDIATE RATER (Last, First, MI) | | g. SSN | h. SIGNATURE |
| i. GRADE, BRANCH, ORGANIZATION, DUTY ASSIGNMENT | | j. DATE | |
| k. NAME OF SENIOR RATER (Last, First, MI) | | l. SSN | m. SIGNATURE |
| n. GRADE, BRANCH, ORGANIZATION, DUTY ASSIGNMENT | | o. DATE | |
| p. SIGNATURE OF RATED OFFICER | | q. DATE | r. DATE ENTERED ON DA FORM 21 |
| | | s. RATED OFFICER MPO INITIALS | t. SR MPO INITIALS |
| | | u. NO OF INCL | |

PART III - DUTY DESCRIPTION (Rated)

| | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|
| a. PRINCIPAL DUTY TITLE | b. SSN/MOS |
| c. REFER TO PART III, DA FORM 67, 8-1 | |

PART IV - PERFORMANCE EVALUATION - PROFESSIONALISM (Rated)

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| a. PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY (In Items 1 through 14 below, indicate the degree of agreement with the following statements as being descriptive of the rated officer. Any comments will be reflected in b below.) | | HIGH DEGREE LOW DEGREE 1 2 3 4 5 | |
| 1. Possesses capacity to acquire knowledge/grasp concepts | | 8. Displays sound judgment | |
| 2. Demonstrates appropriate knowledge and expertise in assigned tasks | | 9. Seeks self improvement | |
| 3. Maintains appropriate level of physical fitness | | 10. Is adaptable to changing situations | |
| 4. Motivates, challenges and develops subordinates | | 11. Sets and enforces high standards | |
| 5. Performs under physical and mental stress | | 12. Possesses military bearing and appearance | |
| 6. Encourages candor and frankness in subordinates | | 13. Supports EO EFO | |
| 7. Clear and concise in written communication | | 14. Clear and concise in oral communication | |
| b. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS (Comment on any area where the rated officer is particularly outstanding or needs improvement) | | | |
| c. EDUCATION d. DEPENDABILITY e. INTEGRITY f. MORAL COURAGE g. SELFLESSNESS h. MORAL STANDARDS | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| PERIOD COVERED _____ | |
| PART V - PERFORMANCE AND POTENTIAL EVALUATION (Rater) | |
| a. RATED OFFICER'S NAME _____ SSN _____ RATED OFFICER IS ASSIGNED IN ONE OF HIS/HER DESIGNATED SPECIALTIES MOS <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO | |
| b. PERFORMANCE DURING THIS RATING PERIOD. REFER TO PART III DA FORM 67-8 AND PART III a, b, AND c, DA FORM 67-8-1. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <input type="checkbox"/> ALWAYS EXCEEDED REQUIREMENTS <input type="checkbox"/> USUALLY EXCEEDED REQUIREMENTS <input type="checkbox"/> MET REQUIREMENTS <input type="checkbox"/> OFTEN FAILED REQUIREMENTS <input type="checkbox"/> USUALLY FAILED REQUIREMENTS </div> | |
| c. COMMENT ON SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PERFORMANCE. REFER TO PART III DA FORM 67-8 AND PART III a, b, AND c, DA FORM 67-8-1. DO NOT USE FOR COMMENTS ON POTENTIAL. <div style="height: 200px; border: 1px solid black;"></div> | |
| d. THIS OFFICER'S POTENTIAL FOR PROMOTION TO THE NEXT HIGHER GRADE IS: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <input type="checkbox"/> PROMOTE AHEAD OF CONTEMPORARIES <input type="checkbox"/> PROMOTE WITH CONTEMPORARIES <input type="checkbox"/> DO NOT PROMOTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (if explain below) </div> | |
| e. COMMENT ON POTENTIAL <div style="height: 80px; border: 1px solid black;"></div> | |
| PART VI - INTERMEDIATE RATER | |
| a. COMMENTS <div style="height: 150px; border: 1px solid black;"></div> | |
| PART VII - SENIOR RATER | |
| a. POTENTIAL EVALUATION (See Chapter 1, AR 600-105) <div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-right: 10px;">SR</div> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-left: 10px;">DA USE ONLY</div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; width: 45%;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; width: 45%;"></div> </div> <div style="margin-top: 10px;"> HI <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></div> LO <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></div> </div> | b. COMMENTS <div style="height: 250px; border: 1px solid black;"></div> |
| A COMPLETED DA FORM 67-8-1 WAS RECEIVED WITH THIS REPORT AND CONSIDERED IN MY EVALUATION AND REVIEW. <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO (explain in h) | |

APPENDIX D
Coast Guard Officer Evaluation Report

COAST GUARD OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT

The Coast Guard uses exactly the same form in the evaluation of all of its officers except that the title changes with the grade of the officer being rated. The example enclosed is for a CAPTAIN but separate ones are used in COMMANDERS, LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS, LIEUTENANTS, LIEUTENANT (Junior Grade), ENSIGNS, and WARRANTS.

Section 1 - Administrative Data. Section 1 includes background information on the reported-on officer.

Section 2 - Description of Duties. A 2-inch space on the front of the Officer Evaluation Report (OER) is provided so a detailed description of the reported-on officer's duties and responsibilities can be recorded. This description must include number of people supervised, funds controlled, unit operations, organizational relationships, etc.

Sections 3 through 6 - Rating Scales (Supervisor). This portion of the OER is designed to measure an officer's performance and qualities in four evaluation areas: (1) performance of duties, (2) interpersonal relations, (3) leadership skills, and (4) communication skills. It is completed by the officer's supervisor. Two or more performance dimensions (rating scales) compose each evaluation area. Officers are evaluated on each performance dimension using a 7-point behavior example rating scale. At scale points 2, 4, and 6, there are sets of behavior examples describing that specific level of performance. These behavior examples are standards reflecting below average, average, and superior behaviors for a specific grade of officers in the Coast Guard. The specific standards vary depending upon the officer's grade. A narrative space for supporting comments follows each set of dimensions.

Section 7 - Supervisor Authentication. A space is provided for the supervisor's signature and title.

Section 8 - Reporting Officer Comments. A narrative section is provided for the reporting officer to comment on the reported-on officer's leadership ability and potential for greater responsibility in the Coast Guard. These comments are based in part on the performance and qualities demonstrated by the officer during the reporting period. The reporting officer then completes Sections 9-13.

Sections 9 and 10 - Rating Scales (Reporting Officer). The reporting officer evaluates an officer's personal qualities and ability to represent the Coast Guard using a scale format similar to those completed by the supervisor. A narrative section for supporting comments follows each set of graded dimensions.

Section 11 - Leadership and Potential. A narrative section is provided for the reporting officer to comment on the reported-on officer's leadership ability and potential for greater responsibility in the Coast Guard. These comments are based in part on the performance and qualities demonstrated by the officer during the reporting period.

Section 12 - Comparison Scale and Distribution. This section consists of a 7-point (box) scale with anchors ranging from "Unsatisfactory" through "A Distinguished Officer." The reporting officer places an "X" in the box that most closely reflects the reporting officer's ranking of the reported-on officer relative to all other officers of the same grade with whom the reporting officer is familiar.

Sections 13 and 14 - Reporting Officer Authentication and Reviewer Authentication. Space is provided for signatures of the reporting officer and the reviewing officer.

CAPTAIN
OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT (OER)

THE REPORTED-ON OFFICER WILL COMPLETE SECTION 1, ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|----------|--------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| a. NAME (Last, First, Middle Initial) | | | | b. SSN | | c. GRADE 06 | d. DATE OF RANK YR MO DAY | |
| e. UNIT NAME | | | f. DIST | g. OPFAC | h. OBC | i. STATUS INDICATOR | | j. DATE SUBMITTED YR MO DAY |
| k. DATE REPORTED PRESENT UNIT YR MO DAY | | | l. TYPE REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> Regular <input type="checkbox"/> Special <input type="checkbox"/> Concurrent | | | m. OCCASION FOR REGULAR REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-Annual <input type="checkbox"/> Detachment of Reporting Officer <input type="checkbox"/> Detachment of Officer <input type="checkbox"/> Promotion of Officer | | |
| n. PERIOD OF REPORT YR MO DAY TO YR MO DAY | | | o. DAYS NOT OBSERVED PCS TAD LV OTHER | | | p. REPORTED-ON OFFICER SIGNATURE | | |

THE SUPERVISOR WILL COMPLETE SECTIONS 2-7. In Section 2, describe this officer's job including primary and collateral duties, resources available and relationship to unit or Coast Guard missions. Then for each of the rating scales in Sections 3-6, compare the officer's performance during the reporting period against the standards shown and assign a mark by filling in the appropriate circle. In the area following each section, describe the basis for the marks given, citing specifics where possible. Use only allotted space. Complete Section 7.

2. DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES

☐ Documentation Reference:

3. PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES: Measures an officer's ability to get things done.

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--------------------|
| <p>a. BEING PREPARED</p> <p>Demonstrated ability to anticipate, to identify what must be done, to set priorities, and prepare for accomplishing unit and organizational missions under both predictable and uncertain conditions</p> | <p>Gets caught by the unexpected. Appears controlled by events/crises. Sets vague or unrealistic goals, if any. Sets wrong priorities. Tends not to follow existing operating procedures, plans or systems. Not always prepared to meet responsibilities or missions</p> | <p>Takes prompt positive action to meet changing or unexpected situations. Rarely caught, unprepared. Sets high and realistic goals. Uses existing operating procedures, plans, or systems well. Uses good basic management tools and ideas. "Does homework" to stay well prepared for responsibilities and missions</p> | <p>Anticipates extremely well. Looks beyond the immediate events/problems. Sets the "right" priorities and controls events. Sets realistic and specific goals well in advance. Utilizes people, operating procedures, plans, systems to achieve the highest state of preparation for accomplishing responsibilities and missions. Turns potential adversity into opportunity</p> | <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> | <p>9</p> <p>10</p> |
| <p>b. USING RESOURCES</p> <p>Demonstrated ability to utilize people, money, material, and time efficiently, to delegate, and to provide follow up control</p> | <p>May over/under allocate resources, concentrate on unproductive areas, or overlook some critical demands. More effective managing a narrow range of activities. Over/under manages; doesn't delegate wisely. Under-utilizes people or "burns" them out. Doesn't follow up.</p> | <p>Successfully manages a variety of activities simultaneously with the resources available. Is cost conscious. Delegates, gets job done well through others. Uses follow-up control effectively, requires same of subordinates</p> | <p>Unusually skillful at bringing scarce resources to bear on the most critical demands while managing a spectrum of activities. Constantly "does more with less." Delegates whenever possible. Has the "big picture." Always knows what's going on. "Stays on top of things."</p> | 1 | 2 |
| <p>c. GETTING RESULTS</p> <p>The quality/quantity of the officer's work accomplishments. The effectiveness or impact of results on the officer's unit and/or the Coast Guard</p> | <p>Usually obtains results, though sometimes at the cost of extra resources or lost opportunities. In routine situations will meet specified goals. Results usually maintain the status quo</p> | <p>Gets the job done well in all routine and most unusual situations. Fulfills identified goals and requirements even when resources are scarce. Produces finished, quality work and requires same from subordinates. Results have a positive impact on unit and/or Coast Guard</p> | <p>Gets results which far surpass your expectations in all situations. Always finds ways to do more and do it better in spite of resource constraints. Own work and that of subordinates is consistently of high quality; never needs redoing. Results have significant positive impact on unit and/or Coast Guard</p> | 1 | 2 |
| <p>d. RESPONSIVENESS</p> <p>The degree to which the officer responds, replies, or meets deadlines in a timely fashion</p> | <p>Needs reminding; doesn't report back. Tends to miss due dates/deadlines without justification. Slow or late responding to requests, memos, letters, or calls. Resists changes in policy, direction, or responsibilities</p> | <p>Reports back, keeps you informed. Dependably completes projects and meets deadlines. Makes timely response to requests, memos, letters, or calls. Takes changes in policy, direction, or responsibilities in stride</p> | <p>Highly conscientious in keeping you well informed. Adept at findings ways to complete projects early. Unusually prompt in responding to all requests, memos, letters, or calls. Readily adjusts to major changes in policy, direction, or responsibilities, extremely flexible</p> | 1 | 2 |
| <p>e. PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE</p> <p>The level of service knowledge and technical skills the officer demonstrates in the present job (includes seamanship/airmanship, engineering, commercial vessel safety, SAR, law, etc., as appropriate)</p> | <p>Basically qualified. Demonstrates minimal technical skills. Completes routine assignments but requires some supervision and technical guidance. Has shown little or no effort to broaden knowledge or skills</p> | <p>A professional officer who knows the job. Demonstrates needed technical expertise for assigned duties. Needs no supervision for technical assignments. Seeks new experiences to learn; has shown steady growth in knowledge and skills. Shares experiences and knowledge</p> | <p>An expert. Demonstrates superior technical competence under a variety of circumstances. Recognizes and resolves complex issues/problems. Never needs guidance or supervision. Sought after for experience and knowledge. Advice is always "on the mark." Develops better ways to do things</p> | 1 | 2 |

f. COMMENTS (Performance of Duties):

f. COMMENTS (Performance of Duties continued):

4. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS: Measures how an officer affects or is affected by others.

| a. WORKING WITH OTHERS | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Demonstrated ability to promote a team effort, to cooperate, and to work with other people or units to achieve common goals | | | Sometimes disregards the ideas and feelings of others, or causes hostility because of failure to inform or consult. May be impatient/impolite, talk too much, listen too little. May be inflexible, lose temper or control. Is slow to resolve conflicts. Not a team player. | | Encourages expression of ideas, listens. Respects the views, ideas of others. cooperative, fosters a sense of teamwork. Keeps others informed, consults others. Carries share of load. Treats people in considerate, courteous manner. Helps others resolve conflicts and stay focused on team goals. | | Stimulates open expression of ideas; draws people out, communicates up down across. Comfortable working with others of all ranks/positions. Gets different people and organizations to work together without malice; inspires them to achieve goals which would not otherwise have been obtained. | | N/D |
| b. HUMAN RELATIONS | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| The degree to which the officer fulfills the letter and spirit of the Commandant's Human Relations Policy and shows respect and evenhandedness in dealing with others, senior and junior | | | Exhibits discriminatory tendencies toward others due to their religion, age, sex, race, or ethnic background. Allows bias to influence appraisals or the treatment of others. May use position to harass others, is disrespectful, may make slurring remarks. Doesn't hold subordinates accountable for their human relations responsibilities. | | Treats others fairly and with dignity regardless of religion, age, sex, race or ethnic background. Carries out work, training, and appraisal responsibilities without bias. Holds subordinates accountable for living up to the spirit of the Commandant's Human Relations Policy. | | Through leadership and demonstrated strong personal commitment inspires fair and equal treatment of others in all situations, regardless of religion, age, sex, race or ethnic background. Does not tolerate prejudicial actions or behavior by anyone. Makes clearly noteworthy contributions to this end. | | |

c. COMMENTS (Interpersonal Relations):

5. LEADERSHIP SKILLS: Measures an officer's ability to guide, direct, develop, influence, and support others in their performance of work.

| a. LOOKING OUT FOR OTHERS | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|-----|
| The officer's sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs, problems, goals, and achievement of others | | | Shows little concern for the safety, problems, needs, goals of others. May overlook or tolerate unfair, insensitive, or abusive treatment of people. May be accessible to others, but non-responsive to their personal needs. Seldom acknowledges or recognizes subordinates' achievements. | | Cares about people. Recognizes and responds to their needs. Concerned for their safety/well-being. Is accessible. Listens and helps with personal or job related problems, needs, and goals. When unable to assist, suggests or provides other resources. "Goes to bat" for people. Rewards deserving subordinates in a timely fashion. | | Creates an attitude of caring and a sense of community in others. Personally ensures resources are available to meet people's needs and that limits of endurance are not exceeded. Always accessible to people and their problems. Does not tolerate unfair, insensitive, or abusive treatment of or by others. Extremely conscientious in ensuring deserving subordinates get appropriate timely recognition. | | N/D |
| b. DEVELOPING SUBORDINATES | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| The extent to which an officer uses coaching, counseling, and training and provides opportunities for growth to increase the skills, knowledge, and proficiency of subordinates | | | Shows little interest in training or development of subordinates. May unnecessarily withhold authority or over-supervise. Doesn't challenge their abilities. May tolerate marginal performance, or criticize excessively. Doesn't keep subordinates informed, provides little constructive feedback. | | Provides opportunities which encourage subordinates to expand their roles, handle important tasks, and learn by doing. Delegates and holds subordinates accountable. Recognizes good performance, corrects shortcomings. Provides opportunities for training which support professional growth. | | Creates challenging situations which prompt unusually high level development of people. Unit or work group runs like "clockwork". People always know what's going on and routinely handle the unexpected. Holds subordinates accountable, provides timely praise and constructive criticism. Provides active and creative training opportunities. | | |
| c. DIRECTING OTHERS | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| The officer's effectiveness in influencing or directing others in the accomplishment of tasks or missions | | | An officer who has difficulty controlling and influencing others effectively. May not instill confidence or enhance cooperation among subordinates and others. Sets work standards that may be vague or misunderstood. Tolerates late or marginal performance. Falters in difficult situations. | | A leader who earns the support and commitment of others. Sets high work standards and expectations which are clearly understood. Requires people to meet those standards. Evenhanded. Keeps people motivated and on track even when "the going gets tough". | | A strong leader who commands respect and inspires others to achieve results not normally attainable. People want to serve under his/her leadership. Communicates high work standards and expectations which are clearly understood. Gets superior results even in time critical and difficult situations. Wins over rather than imposes will. | | |
| d. EVALUATING SUBORDINATES | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| The extent to which an officer conducts, or requires others to conduct, accurate, uninflated, and timely evaluations for enlisted, civilian, and officer personnel | | | Prepares evaluations that are late, inconsistent with actual performance, or not within system guidelines. "Second guesses" the system. Reports often need to be improved or redone. Doesn't hold subordinates accountable for their ratings. Provides little or no counseling for subordinates. | | Prepares evaluations which are timely, fair, accurate, and consistent with system standards. Required narratives are concise, descriptive, and contribute to understanding subordinates' performance and qualities. Seldom gets reports returned for correction/adjustment. Provides constructive counseling where needed. Does not accept inaccurate, inflated, or poorly prepared reports from others. | | Prepares evaluations which are always on time, fair, accurate and clearly measure performance against the standards. Never gets reports returned for correction/adjustment. Uses performance evaluation as a tool to develop subordinates, and achieves notable performance improvement. Sets an example in supporting established guidelines. | | |

e. COMMENTS (Leadership Skills):

6. COMMUNICATION SKILLS: Measures an officer's ability to communicate in a positive, clear, and convincing manner.

| a. SPEAKING AND LISTENING | | b. WRITING | | c. ARTICULATING IDEAS | |
|---|---|--|--|---|-----|
| How well an officer speaks and listens in individual, group, or public situations | Communicates ideas but is hampered by poor grammar, inappropriate language, or distracting mannerisms. Rambles/loses audience. Does not exhibit confidence when speaking; may be unprepared. Listens poorly; doesn't give others a chance to speak. | Writes material which may be hard to understand or does not support conclusions reached. May use jargon or trite phrases, rambling sentences/paragraphs, or incorrect grammar, structure, format. May overuse the passive voice. Own work or that of subordinates often needs correction or rewrite. | Writes clearly and simply. Material addresses subject, flows well, achieves intended purpose. Uses short sentences/paragraphs, personal pronouns, and the active voice. Avoids bureaucratic, technical jargon, or big words when little ones will do. Own work or that of subordinates rarely needs correction or rewrite. | Speaks in an articulate, captivating manner. Always confident and credible in both private and public situations. Skillfully uses gestures, inflections, and humor to emphasize and persuade. Encourages others to respond; is an attentive listener. | N/O |
| ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑥ |
| How well an officer communicates through written material | May have valid ideas, but lacks organization or a confident delivery. May argue rather than discuss, or may interpret irrelevant comments. Contributes little that is germane or useful. Unreceptive to ideas of others. | Expresses ideas and concepts in an organized, understandable manner. Points out pro's and con's. Uses sound reasoning; doesn't get off subject. Receptive to ideas of others. Can speak well "off the cuff." | Readily establishes credibility. Concise, persuasive, and engaging. Delivers ideas with a convincing logic and common sense. Thinks things through. Clearly states key issues and consequences. Builds on the ideas of others. "Think's well on feet" in all situations. | ① | ② |
| ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑥ |

d. COMMENTS (Communication Skills):**7. SUPERVISOR AUTHENTICATION**

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------|--------|----------------------|-----------|
| a. SIGNATURE | b. GRADE | c. SSN | d. TITLE OF POSITION | e. DATE |
| | | | | YR MC DAY |

THE REPORTING OFFICER WILL COMPLETE SECTIONS 8-13. In Section 8, Comment on the Supervisor's evaluation of this officer (Optional). Then for each of the rating scales in Section 9 and 10 compare this officer against the standards shown and assign a mark by filling in the appropriate circle. In the area following each section describe the basis for the mark given citing specifics where possible. Use only allotted space. Complete Sections 11, 12 and 13.

8. REPORTING OFFICER COMMENTS**9. PERSONAL QUALITIES:** Measures selected qualities which illustrate the character of the individual.

| a. INITIATIVE | | b. JUDGMENT | | c. RESPONSIBILITY | | d. STAMINA | | e. SOBRIETY | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|-----|---|---|--|---|-----|
| Demonstrated ability to move forward, make changes, and to seek responsibility without guidance and supervision | Tends to postpone needed action. Implements change only when confronted by necessity or directed to do so. Often overtaken by events. May suppress initiative of subordinates. May be non-supportive of changes directed by higher authority. | May not show sound logic or common sense in making difficult decisions. Sometimes acts too quickly or too late, gets hung up in details, or overlooks key elements. Too often makes wrong decisions. | Demonstrates analytical thought and common sense in making proper decisions. Uses facts and experience and considers the impact of alternatives. Weighs risk, cost, and time considerations. Makes sound decisions in a timely fashion with the best information available. | Originates, nurtures, promotes, or brings about new ideas, methods or practices which result in significant improvements to unit and/or Coast Guard. Does not promote change for sake of change. Makes worthwhile ideas/practices work when others may have given up. Always takes positive action well in advance. | N/O | Demonstrated commitment to getting the job done and to hold one's self accountable for own and subordinates' actions; courage of convictions; ability to accept decisions contrary to own views and make them work. | Usually can be depended upon to do the right thing. Normally accountable for own work. May accept less than satisfactory work or tolerate indifference. Tends not to get involved or speak up. Provides minimal support for decisions counter to own ideas. | Possesses high standard of honor and integrity. Holds self and subordinates accountable. Keeps commitments even when uncomfortable or difficult to do so. Speaks up when necessary, even if position is unpopular. Loyal to Coast Guard. Supports organizational policies/decisions which may be counter to own ideas. | Uncompromising in matters of honor and integrity. Places goals of Coast Guard above personal ambitions and gains. "Goes the extra mile, and more." Always holds self and subordinates accountable for production and actions. Has the courage to be heard. Will stand up and be counted. Succeeds in making even unpopular policies/decisions work. | N/O |
| ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑥ | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | |
| Demonstrated ability to arrive at sound decisions and make sound recommendations by using experience, common sense, and analytical thought in the decision process | Performance becomes marginal under stress or during periods of extended work. May make poor decisions, overlook key factors, focus on wrong priorities, or lose sight of safety considerations. Belks at putting in necessary overtime. Becomes rattled in time sensitive stressful situations. | Performance is sustained under stress or during periods of extended work with no loss of productivity or safety. Works extra hours when necessary to get the job done. Stays cool when the pressure is on. | Performance reaches an unusually high level when under stress or during periods of extended work. Can work long hours over several days and still remain very productive and safe. Thrives under stressful situations. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑥ | |
| ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑥ | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | |
| The officer's ability to think and act effectively under conditions that are stressful and/or mentally or physically fatiguing | Use of alcohol sets poor example, or results in reduced job performance. May bring discredit to service through alcohol influenced incidents while off duty. Does not seek help for people with alcohol related problems. Fails to take timely action to prevent alcohol related incidents. | Uses alcohol discriminately and in moderation, or not at all. Job performance never affected by use of alcohol, no discredit brought to service. Does not tolerate intemperate use by others. Supports alcohol education programs and seeks help for those with alcohol related problems. | Meets standards in column four. In addition holds supervisors accountable for discouraging intemperate use and taking timely action to prevent alcohol related incidents. A leader in carrying out alcohol education programs. Creates leisure time alternatives to alcohol use. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑥ | |
| ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑥ | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | |
| The extent to which an officer exercises moderation in the use of alcohol and induces others to do same | | | | | | | | | | |

f. COMMENTS (Personal Qualities):

10. REPRESENTING THE COAST GUARD: Measures an officer's ability to bring credit to the Coast Guard through looks and actions

| a. APPEARANCE | | b. CUSTOMS AND COURTESIES | | c. PROFESSIONALISM | | d. DEALING WITH THE PUBLIC | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| The extent to which an officer appears neat, smart, and well-groomed, in uniform or civilian attire, conforms to prescribed weight standards, and uniformly requires subordinates to do the same | May not always meet uniform or grooming standards. Civilian attire may be inappropriate at times. May not present a physically trim appearance. Does not hold subordinates to service standards | Appears neat, smart and well groomed in uniform and civilian attire. Presents physically trim appearance. Requires subordinates to conform to grooming/uniform standards and maintain a physically trim appearance | Always presents an impeccable appearance. Clearly meets grooming standards. Demonstrates great care in wearing and maintaining uniforms and civilian attire. Has a smart physically trim military appearance. Fosters excellence in grooming, dress and physical appearance of subordinates and others | Occasionally lax in observing basic military customs, courtesies, and traditions. May not show proper respect when dealing with others. Tolerates lax behavior on part of subordinates | Correct in conforming to military traditions, customs, and courtesies. Conveys their importance to others and requires subordinates to conform. Treats people with courtesy and consideration; ensures subordinates do the same | Well-versed in how Coast Guard objectives, policies, procedures serve the public, communicates these effectively. Straightforward, cooperative, and evenhanded in dealing with the public and government. Aware of impact/impression actions may cause on others. Supports CG ideals. Leads a personal life which reinforces CG image | Recognized as an expert in Coast Guard affairs. Works creatively and confidently with representatives of public and government. Inspires confidence and trust and clearly conveys dedication to Coast Guard ideals in public and private life. Leaves everyone with a very positive image of self and Coast Guard |
| ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑥ | ⑦ | ⑧ |
| ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑥ | ⑦ | ⑧ |
| ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑥ | ⑦ | ⑧ |
| ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ | ⑥ | ⑦ | ⑧ |

COMMENTS (Representing the Coast Guard):

11. LEADERSHIP AND POTENTIAL. (Describe this officer's demonstrated leadership ability and overall potential for greater responsibility, promotion, special assignment, and command. Comments should be related to those areas for which the Reporting Officer has the appropriate background.)

12. COMPARISON SCALE AND DISTRIBUTION. (Considering your comments above, in line a, compare this captain with others of the same grade whom you have known in your career.)

| UNSATISFACTORY | A QUALIFIED OFFICER | ONE OF THE MANY COMPETENT PROFESSIONALS WHO FORM THE MAJORITY OF THIS GRADE | | | AN EXCEPTIONAL OFFICER | A DISTINGUISHED OFFICER |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| FOR HEADQUARTERS USE ONLY | | | | | | |
| b. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

13. REPORTING OFFICER AUTHENTICATION

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------|--------|----------------------|-----------|
| a. SIGNATURE | b. GRADE | c. SSN | d. TITLE OF POSITION | e. DATE |
| | | | | YR MO DAY |

14. REVIEWER AUTHENTICATION

☐ COMMENTS ATTACHED

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------|--------|----------------------|-----------|
| a. SIGNATURE | b. GRADE | c. SSN | d. TITLE OF POSITION | e. DATE |
| | | | | YR MO DAY |

APPENDIX E
MARINE CORPS PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

MARINE CORPS PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

At the time of the interviews, the Marine Corps was proposing to change its form and some elements of the appraisal process. This appendix, therefore, may or may not accurately describe the current USMC appraisal process.

Section A - Administrative Data. Administrative data, such as name, rank, and duty assignment, are recorded by the reporting senior in this section.

Section B - Performance Ratings. A list of 21 traits and qualities, such as leadership, endurance, and loyalty, are evaluated on a 6-point scale from "Unsatisfactory" to "Outstanding" by the reporting senior. Section B also calls for an estimate of the Marine's "general value to the service," a recommendation for promotion and next duty assignment, and an indication of the reporting senior's willingness to have the reported-on Marine in his command. (Note that in the form supplied by the Marine Corps for inclusion in this technical report, Block 15a is incorrectly identified as 15d.)

Section C - Narrative. A narrative section is provided for the reporting senior to record a concise appraisal of the professional character of the reported-on Marine.

Section D - Signatures. A space is provided for the signatures of the reported-on Marine, reporting senior, and reviewing officer.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel)
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) (OASN) (M&RA)
Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (MP&T) (OP-01)
Assistant for MPT Research and Development and Studies (OP-01B7)
Director, Military Personnel Policy Division (OP-13)
Director, Submarine Manpower and Training Requirements (OP-29)
Director, Command Surface Warfare Manpower and Training Requirements (OP-39)
Command Aviation Manpower and Training (OP-59)
Commander, Naval Military Personnel Command (NMPC-00/PERS-1)
Director, Distribution Department (NMPC-4)
Director, Distribution Management and Control Division (NMPC-46)
Commander, U.S. ARI, Behavioral and Social Sciences, Alexandria, VA (PERI-POT-1)
Commander, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Brooks Air Force Base, TX,
Manpower and Personnel Division (AFHRL/MO), Scientific and Technical Information
(STINFO) Office
Commander, Coast Guard Headquarters
Superintendent, Naval Postgraduate School
President, National Defense University (3)
Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) (2)

[illegible]